Forty - Ninth
Federal - Provincial
Wildlife Conference

TRANSACTIONS
1985

Halifax, Nova Scotia
25 June – 28 June

86-01744/

Environment Canada
Canadian Wildlife Service

Environnement Canada
Service canadien de la faune

Transactions of the
Forty-ninth Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference
held in Halifax, Nova Scotia
25-28 June
1985

Issued under the authority of the
Minister of Environment

Canadian Wildlife Service

Minister of Supply and Services Canada 1985
Catalogue No. CW 69-3/49E
ISBN 0-662-14422-8
ISSN 0069-0007

Printing: National Printers (Ottawa) Inc.
Contract No. KN107-5-2374

CONTENTS

5 Summary of the 49th Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference

13 Official welcome -- The Hon. K. Streatch
15 -- The Hon. W. Mathews
16 -- The Hon. C. Maxwell

Update reports (1)

17 Wildlife Habitat Canada -- D.J. Neave
18 Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) -- B. Tétreault
21 Comments on CITES update report
22 "North American Waterfowl Management Plan" -- J.H. Patterson
24 Forestry/Wildlife Symposium -- D. Hagan
25 Comments on Forestry/Wildlife Symposium update report
26 Fur Institute of Canada -- R. Gilbert
29 Canadian Wildlife Service -- B. Tétreault
33 Comments on CWS update report
34 US Fish and Wildlife Service -- D. Minnich

Keynote address

40 (1) Introduction of Keynote Speaker -- J.Y. Hickman
41 (2) Keynote address: Communicating about wildlife -- M. Halleran
52 (3) Summary of discussion

Panel: Communicating about wildlife

56 (1) Introduction of panel moderator -- J.Y. Hickman
57 (2) Moderator's comments -- D. Dodds
59 (3) Communicating with the forester -- W. Young
65 (4) Communicating with the farmer -- R.K. Smith
73 (5) Communicating with the user -- M. Hummel
77 (6) Communicating with the politician -- R. Simmons
82 (7) Introduction to summary and discussion -- J.A. Keith
83 (8) A summary of the keynote speech and panel -- D. Dodds
88 (9) Discussion on summary of keynote speech and panel

Case studies of communication

91 (1) Introduction of speakers -- J.A. Keith
93 (2) Newfoundland seal fishery -- D. Quinton
101 (3) New Brunswick forest spraying -- T. Crowther
106 (4) Wolf control in British Columbia -- A. Murray
115 (5) Summary of discussion on case studies

Techniques of communication

124 (1) Introduction of speaker -- A.J. Macaulay
125 (2) Effective public relations -- C. Radimer
144 (3) Summary of discussion

146 Report on conference findings -- A.J. Macaulay

Update reports (2)

151 National Wildlife Week (NWW) -- K.A. Brynaert
157 Summary of discussion on NWW
161 "Canadian wildlife administration" -- R.C. Goulden
169 National Colloquium on Wildlife Conservation -- J. Cinq-Mars
171 Ramsar Convention -- J.H. Patterson
172 International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) -- K.A. Brynaert
175 "World conservation strategy" (WCS) -- D. Munro
179 Summary of discussion on WCS

Reports (program highlights)

180 Alberta Fish and Wildlife Division
184 Manitoba Wildlife Branch
191 New Brunswick Department of Natural Resources
194 Newfoundland and Labrador Wildlife Division
198 Northwest Territories Department of Renewable Resources
201 Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources
207 Prince Edward Island Fish and Wildlife Division
213 Quebec Wildlife Branch
222 Saskatchewan Wildlife Branch
226 Canadian Nature Federation
229 Canadian Federation of Humane Societies -- J.H. Bandow
231 Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada (COSEWIC) -- J.A. Keith
234 Status of waterfowl, June 1985 -- L. Métras
239 Polar Bear Administrative Committee -- I. Stirling
241 Canadian Committee on Ungulate Management (CCUM)
243 World Wildlife Fund (WWF) Canada
248 Ducks Unlimited (DU) Canada
256 Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES)
258 Canadian Wildlife Federation -- K.A. Brynaert

261 Recommendations of the 49th Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference

265 Attendance at 49th conference

274 Report on action taken on recommendations of the 48th Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference

SUMMARY OF THE 49TH FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL WILDLIFE CONFERENCE

1. Conference opening

Merrill Prime, Director, Nova Scotia Wildlife Division, was the Chairman for the conference. He opened the conference by welcoming everyone and stating that he wished that the discussions over the next few days would be productive, yet relaxing, as they followed the theme of the conference, "Communicating about wildlife". As Chairman he extended his sincere appreciation to the Program Committee for their hard work in developing the program. He then introduced his Minister, the Hon. Ken Streatch, Minister of Lands and Forests for the Province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. Streatch welcomed everyone, with a special welcome to his colleagues, the Hon. Colin Maxwell from Saskatchewan, the Hon. William Mathews from Newfoundland, and the Hon. George McMahon from Prince Edward Island. He said it was a great pleasure for his department to host that distinguished and important conference and he looked forward to the participation of all delegates during the meetings to follow. He announced that the Government of Nova Scotia had just approved a document which outlined provincial policies respecting the conservation of wildlife habitat in Nova Scotia. He also mentioned a proposed multi-million dollar 5-year agreement with Ducks Unlimited and Habitat Canada that was being prepared for the purpose of developing some of Nova Scotia's more productive wetlands. He stated that the results of the Nova Scotia Royal Commission on Forestry, released in the spring, recommended that wildlife and its habitat must be considered in all future forest management plans in the province. He considered this to be very significant because wildlife was being given greater recognition in the long-range management of their provincial resources. He concluded by saying that he believed the theme of the conference, "Communicating about wildlife", was challenging and that during the course of discussions they would probably bring into focus the significance of wildlife management, educational, and public relations staff working more closely together as a team to ensure that wildlife considerations received a higher ranking when decisions were being made, in a society that was very competitive, for a stake in resource development and allocation. He then called on the other Ministers present to bring greetings from their respective provinces.

The Hon. Bill Mathews, Minister of Culture, Recreation, and Youth for the Province of Newfoundland, stated that Newfoundland was very pleased to participate in the conference. He then introduced the six members of his delegation. He expressed interest in discussions and deliberations with the other Ministers about common concerns and problems that they might have as they went through the conference. He said that wildlife was most important to the people of Newfoundland, in particular the native people who depended on wildlife and game for subsistence. He continued that in recent years there had been greater public awareness and a greater degree of public co-operation within Newfoundland, particularly with regard to wildlife management.

The Hon. Colin Maxwell, Minister of Parks and Renewable Resources for the Province of Saskatchewan, introduced his delegation. He said that wildlife was also important to Saskatchewan. He mentioned that this year Saskatchewan had passed a critical Wildlife Habitat Protection Act that placed 500 000 ha under the act. This land could not be altered or sold and it would be preserved for wildlife.

2. Presentation of the agenda

Mr. Prime introduced the Program Committee and expressed his regret that Rich Goulden could not attend the conference due to ill health. Stew Morrison, another committee member, was out of the country and unable to attend the conference. Other members of the committee included Doug Pollock (Secretary), Canadian Wildlife Services (CWS); Art Smith, Prince Edward Island; and Bob Bell, Northwest Territories.

He stated that the main thrust of the conference was "Communicating about wildlife", and that Michael Halleran, the Keynote Speaker from the British Columbia Wildlife Federation, would serve as a stimulus for many thought-provoking discussions. The panelists in Tuesday's panel would be outlining how the wildlifers could best communicate their interests and concerns to the various sectors of society. He invited all delegates and guests to participate fully. Wednesday was to be a full day and evening on the town (however, the weather did not co-operate). On Thursday morning there would be high-profile studies about major issues that had arisen in recent years: sealing, predator control, and forest spraying. The aim of these presentations was to illustrate how communication, or lack thereof, played an instrumental role in the outcome of the issues. With the Thursday afternoon session, they hoped to portray what communication was all about: how to do a better job of communicating. He told participants that it was no time to be shy if they were to have a productive session. On Friday morning there would be a report on the conference findings, and the remainder of Friday was to be taken up with general business of the conference.

3. Appointment of Recommendations Committee

Members of the Recommendations Committee included: Hugh Monaghan (Chairman), Yukon Territory; Wayne Roddick (Secretary), Wildlife Habitat Canada; Dave Pike, Newfoundland; Dave Neave, Wildlife Habitat Canada; Jim Stoner, Canadian Wildlife Service; and John Baird, New Brunswick.

4. Representatives to National Waterfowl Advisory Committee

Bert Tétreault, CWS, announced that the provincial representative to be part of the Canadian delegation at the National Waterfowl Advisory Committee meetings in Washington, DC, was Merrill Prime, Nova Scotia, and John Baird from New Brunswick was the alternate. Due to the extreme importance that Canada attached to the North American Waterfowl Management Plan, CWS was also pleased to announce the nomination of Bob Andrews, Alberta, as the Western Canada representative.

5. Report of action taken on 1984 conference recommendations

The Conference Secretary, Doug Pollock, reported that Recommendations Nos. 1 to 5 covered letters of appreciation for hosting various events and letters to non-governmental organizations (NGOs) for sending representatives to the conference. Action completed.

Recommendation No. 6 concerned a letter of appreciation to Don Robinson for over 30 years of service to wildlife and best wishes for his retirement. Action completed.

Recommendation No. 7 dealt with the theme for the 1985 Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference, which was "Communicating about wildlife".

Recommendation No. 8 asked that the federal, provincial, and territorial agencies, as well as any interested national NGOs, be encouraged to become full, participating members in Project WILD. This recommendation was brought to the attention of those concerned, asking that they take whatever action they deemed necessary to become involved.

Recommendation No. 9 dealt with the theme for National Wildlife Week for 1985. "The key to conservation - Responsible stewardship" was unanimously accepted.

Recommendation No. 10 concerned the amended report of the Committee reviewing the National Wildlife Week program and this was unanimously accepted by all jurisdictions.

Recommendations Nos. 11 and 12 dealt with the proposed Canadian Wildlife Management Institute. The Task Force was unable to complete its task so that the action needed on these recommendations could not be taken to completion. The creation of the Institute was proposed for discussion at the up-coming Wildlife Ministers' Colloquium in November.

Recommendation No. 13 dealt with a letter of appreciation to Joe Bryant, acknowledging his many years of service to wildlife, and best wishes were offered to him in his new endeavour as an environment lawyer. Action completed.

Recommendation No. 14 concerned an editorial policy and publishing specifications for "Canadian wildlife administration", which were to be prepared by Manitoba. Ross Thompson, Manitoba, was to give a report.

Recommendation No. 15 dealt with a proposed forestry-wildlife symposium. Doug Hagan from Ontario gave a report.

Recommendation No. 16 was a report on the team-work guidelines that had been prepared and distributed.

Recommendation No. 17 was a recommendation put forward by the Hon. Nellie Cournoyea on the subsistence use of wildlife. This recommendation was brought to the attention of all jurisdictions.

Recommendation No. 18 was also a recommendation put forward by the Hon. Nellie Cournoyea and it involved the "anti" movement concerning hunting and trapping rights. This was brought to the attention of the Chairman of last year's Wildlife Ministers' Conference, the Hon. Alan Pope, as well as to all other Wildlife Ministers.

6. Definition of the role of delegates, guest, and participants

A participant was defined as anyone registered with the conference. A delegate was defined as the official representative of his/her province of territory, as well as the Canadian Wildlife Service. All participants were encouraged to actively participate in all the discussions, as only in this way could they ensure that the conference would provide what they wanted to get out of it. Recommendations could be made to the Recommendations Committee by anyone registered. When the recommendations came back to the floor, participants could participate but the official voting level was one representative from each province and territory and the Canadian Wildlife Service.

7. Update on Wildlife Habitat Canada

Dave Neave, Executive Director, Wildlife Habitat Canada (WHC), gave a brief update on the organization, mentioning several new initiatives WHC would be undertaking in the next few months. Mr. Neave's comments are included in these transactions.

8. Update on CITES

Bert Tétreault, Director General, CWS, presented a brief report on CITES, outlining in particular events that had occurred at the 5th Meeting of the CITES Parties held recently in Buenos Aires, Argentina. Mr. Tétreault's report is included in these transactions.

9. Update on North American Waterfowl Plan

Jim Patterson, Director, Migratory Birds Branch, CWS, spoke on developments concerning the North American Waterfowl Plan. His report is included in these transactions.

10. Update on Forestry/Wildlife Symposium

Doug Hagan, Supervisor, Program Development, Ontario Wildlife Branch, gave a brief update on the Symposium. He mentioned that the Symposium planned for 1986 would be postponed to May 1987 and that it was hoped that it would be held in Thunder Bay, Ont. Mr. Hagan's comments are included in these transactions.

11. Update on the Fur Institute of Canada

Ray Gilbert, Executive Director, Fur Institute of Canada, reported on the activities of his organization. Mr. Gilbert said that among his priorities over the next few months would be the recruitment of funds, particularly for the area of public information. He also hoped to meet with trappers, fur managers, politicians, retailers, and manufacturers, to the degree possible, across Canada. He believed it was vitally important for the Fur Institute to establish and maintain face-to-face communication with their broad-based membership. His report can be found in these transactions.

12. Update on the Canadian Wildlife Service

In his report, Bert Tétreault, Director General, CWS, outlined on-going CWS activities. He mentioned that in the next year or so CWS would be undergoing a reorganization and realignment of programs in accordance with the new change in government. His report is included in these transactions.

13. Update on the US Fish and Wildlife Service

Don Minnich, Deputy Associate Director, Wildlife Management, US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), reported on the activities of his agency. He mentioned that his Service had been involved in a number of major resource efforts of interest to Canadians since the last Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference, i.e. the "Waterfowl management plan", stabilized hunting regulations, fisheries resources, and endangered species, to name a few. Mr. Minnich's complete report is included in these transactions.

14. Keynote Speech

Joe Hickman, Past-President, Canadian Wildlife Federation, introduced the Keynote Speaker, Michael Halleran from the British Columbia Wildlife Federation. Mr. Halleran expressed displeasure that British Columbia had not sent an official representative to the conference. In his paper, Mr. Halleran offered many suggestions for improved communication, notably to think about organizing a national resources television network across the country, utilizing the broadcasting facilities of provincial educational television systems. He said that these systems were out there now and most of them were looking for program material. Mr. Halleran stressed that he had made the task of increasing public support for wildlife his working priority and he hoped that delegates made it theirs. He said that the problem rested with the fact that they themselves, as resource advocates, had not impressed upon the media the fact that they were missing a golden opportunity for really good stories by not finding out more about what was going on in the resource field.

15. Panel: Communicating about wildlife with other resource interests and decision-makers

Dr. Donald Dodds of Acadia University moderated a panel of communication experts. The panelists were Bill Young, Canadian Forestry Association of British Columbia; Keith Smith, Agriculture Extension Centre, Manitoba; Monte Hummel, World Wildlife Fund Canada; and Roger Simmons, MHA, Newfoundland. These gentlemen offered suggestions on how wildlifers could better communicate with other resource interests and politicians. Their reports are all included in these transactions.

16. Summary of Keynote Speech and panel

Dr. Donald Dodds summarized the Keynote Speech and panel. He stressed that there were two important messages that came through in all presentations. These were:

(1) The attitude of the wildlifer when dealing with others, i.e. farmers, foresters, politicians, and users, could mean some success or much failure in communicating the wildlifer's ideas.

(2) Timing communication ideas early would improve the odds towards success, and communicating ideas too late would be ineffective and would also increase the degree of conflict between the wildlifer and whomever he/she wished to influence.

Dr. Dodds' complete summary is included in these transactions.

17. Case studies

J. Anthony Keith, CWS, chaired the session on case studies. David Quinton, CBC TV, Newfoundland, gave a history of the sealing industry in Newfoundland and the problems it had faced over the years. Tom Crowther brought the session up-to-date on the New Brunswick forest spraying program. Mr. Crowther is the Publisher of the "Daily Gleaner" and "Atlantic Advocate". Al Murray, a wildlifer for many years, recently retired from the British Columbia Government, presented a paper on the British Columbia wolf control program. These three reports are included in these transactions.

18. Effective public relations

Carl Radimer, Editor, Informart gave the conference a very intensive look at techniques to use in publicizing their programs--the successful use of public relations. His "RACE formula" (research, analyze, communicate, evaluate) for success was:

(1) Research to determine where public opinion stood.

(2) Analyze the situations, consider the implications, determine relative economies, identify the publics' self-interests.

(3) Communicate using appropriate media to reach the neutrals within the audience.

(4) Evaluate as one went along to determine how public opinion was drifting.

Mr. Radimer's complete report can be found in these transactions.

19. Conference summary

Dr. Sandy Macaulay, Ducks Unlimited Canada, undertook the onerous task of summarizing the findings of the conference. His summarization is included in these transactions.

20. Choice of theme for National Wildlife Weeks, 1986 and 1987

Ken Brynaert, Executive Vice-President, Canadian Wildlife Federation, brought the conference up-to-date on National Wildlife Week activities undertaken by his

federation in 1985. The theme for 1986 was to deal with endangered wildlife; however, the wording of the theme was left to the discretion of the Canadian Wildlife Federation. The theme for 1987 was to embody historical and future wildlife conservation in Canada, as 1987 represented the 100th anniversary of Last Mountain Lake Sanctuary in Saskatchewan.

21. Choice of conference theme for 1986

No decision was reached during the conference on the theme for 1986. Jurisdictions were given a list of possible themes and asked to contact the Conference Secretary by 31 July 1985 with a list of their priorities. To date a theme has not been chosen for next year's conference.

22. Program Committee membership for 1986

The 1986 Program Committee will consist of: new Director General, Canadian Wildlife Service (Chairman); Douglas Pollock (Secretary), CWS; Bob Bell, Northwest Territories Department of Renewable Resources; Barry Meadows, New Brunswick Department of Natural Resources; Jim Walker, British Columbia Department of Environment; Ken Brynaert, Canadian Wildlife Federation; Gregg Sheehy, Canadian Nature Federation; David Neave, Wildlife Habitat Canada; Stew Morrison, Ducks Unlimited Canada; and David Gimmer, Ottawa Ducks Club. Hugh Monaghan, Yukon Territory Department of Renewable Resources, is the alternate.

23. "Canadian wildlife administration"

The status of "Canadian wildlife administration" is currently under review by the various jurisdictions. The Canadian Wildlife Federation is contemplating taking over the publication of this magazine. The editorial policy and publishing specifications prepared by Manitoba are included in these transactions.

24. Update on National Colloquium on Wildlife Conservation

Jean Cinq-Mars, CWS, presented a short update on items to be included in this symposium. November was suggested as a possible date. His update is included in these transactions.

25. Update on RAMSAR

Jim Patterson, CWS, provided this update, which is included in these transactions.

26. Update on IUCN

Ken Brynaert, Canadian Wildlife Federation, briefly outlined some problems that had occurred at the November 1984 meeting of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN). See his report in these transactions.

27. Highlight reports

Eight provinces and one territory, as well as the Canadian Wildlife Service, submitted highlight reports. Nova Scotia, British Columbia, and the Yukon Territory did not submit reports. Reports were received from the US Fish and Wildlife Service and national NGOs. Reports on CITES, COSEWIC, ACPBRM, and the CCUM were also received. All these reports are included in these transactions.

28. Update on "World conservation strategy"

Dr. David Munro announced that from 31 May to 5 June next year an international conference would be held in Ottawa to examine what had been done around the world to implement the "World conservation strategy". His comments are included in these transactions.

29. Recommendations Committee report

Dave Pike, Newfoundland/Labrador, filled in for Hugh Monaghan, Yukon Territory, as Chairman for this session; 16 recommendations were approved by the conference.

30. Attendance

There were 119 registered participants at this year's conference.

31. Dates of subsequent conferences

The following dates have been confirmed, except in one case, for future conferences:

1986, 16-19 June - Ottawa, Ontario
1987, 15-19 June - Northwest Territories
1988 - British Columbia*
1989 - Newfoundland/Labrador
1990 - Manitoba
1991 - New Brunswick

* British Columbia has not yet confirmed that they will host the 1988 conference.

OFFICIAL WELCOME

The Hon. K. Streatch
Minister of Lands and Forests
Nova Scotia

On behalf of the Government of Nova Scotia, and especially the Department of Lands and Forests, I am pleased to convey to you my sincerest welcome to Nova Scotia and to the fine historic city of Halifax for this your 49th Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference.

When you thought about coming to Nova Scotia, you probably conjured up pictures of Peggy's Cove or fishermen on the wharf fixing lobster pots and fishing nets, or perhaps the Bluenose cutting through the water with her crew of wind-tanned seafaring Nova Scotians. Yes, these are available and represent an essential component of our life-style and traditions in "Canada's ocean playground". Probably of equal importance, however, to visitors like yourselves, who are wildlife managers and administrators working with Canada's wildlife resources, is the fact that three-quarters of Nova Scotia is covered with forests, and these forests are the source of more income than either fishing or farming for Nova Scotians. These forests also maintain flourishing populations of wildlife.

More than 250 wildlife species occur in Nova Scotia, ranging from common game species such as the white-tailed deer to a variety of non-game species such as the Bald Eagle, and endangered species such as the Piping Plover. Our white-tailed deer are probably the most prominent in terms of interest. Last year about 96 000 big-game licences were issued, and approximately 52 000 deer harvested.

Most families in this province have close ties with a way of life that includes farming or forestry, so they are acutely aware of the forests and the wildlife they shelter. So it is not surprising to me to see the Statistics Canada results presented to the 47th Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference, held in Edmonton, on "The importance of wildlife to Canadians". That report indicates that Nova Scotians place a good deal of commitment to wildlife in both time and money. They spend more time hunting than the average Canadian, and they are spending more money on their hunting activities. Even the non-hunter spends a greater than average amount of time watching, photographing, and providing food for wildlife.

By and large, Nova Scotia has almost twice as many hunters per capita as the national average. So you can see that wildlife is a very important resource to our residents, and we have some very active citizens' groups that take an interest in wildlife management.

Wildlife habitat

I am delighted to announce to this conference that the Government of Nova Scotia has just approved a document which outlines provincial policies respecting the conservation of wildlife habitat in Nova Scotia. Being cognizant of the fact that the management of wildlife cannot be separated from the management of land and other resources, we have designed these policies to ensure sound land

management practices, including multiple-use resource management and the integration of wildlife objectives into the management of resources for other uses.

To implement such a policy will involve the co-operative efforts of many resource disciplines, and the significance of effective communication becomes very obvious.

Also, a proposed multi-million dollar, 5-year agreement with Ducks Unlimited (DU) and Habitat Canada is being prepared for the purpose of developing some of our more productive wetlands. This year marks the 20th anniversary of DU's work in Nova Scotia, and we are proud to be associated with this fine organization. About 7825 ha of wetlands have been developed in 94 projects to date. We are pleased with these projects and, of course, very excited about our proposals encompassing the next 5 years, which will do much to enhance a variety of wildlife species.

My department's work with fur-bearers has been aided considerably by our Trappers' Association, which does an outstanding job in providing data and assisting our biologists with various projects. This organization has also contributed greatly to the development of a trappers' educational program that we hope to implement in 1986.

The Nova Scotia Wildlife Federation, founded in 1930, is the major organization representing hunters and sport fishermen. In addition, this organization keeps fully abreast of various activities associated with lands and water in the province that may affect fish and wildlife populations. Recommendations are made to my department on an annual basis and serve as an important guide in the management of our fish and wildlife resources. As you will appreciate, the success of our program is very dependent on a good communication network between various government agencies and the public whom we serve.

One of the best examples of a two-way flow of information is the Land Resources Co-ordinating Committee that was set up under our voluntary Planning Board in co-operation with my department about 5 years ago. This committee brings together landowners and landusers for the purpose of discussing matters of mutual interest, such as hunting, trapping, and other forms of outdoor recreation. They have recently addressed such thorny issues as the use of all-terrain vehicles, disposal of toxic wastes, hunting courtesy, and litter. The committee works out a position that is suitable to landowners and landusers and then presents its recommendations to government for consideration. It has proven to be a very successful approach, especially since a large percentage of the land area of this province (approximately 70%) is in private ownership.

To provide information to the public, the Department of Lands and Forests has a forest resources education staff that produces printed materials, television and radio spots, films, and personal letters to answer the public's constant inquiries about the status of our wildlife resources.

Looking to the future, I see more co-operation between the public and the professional staff who are working in the field of wildlife management. Since forest management has the greatest impact on wildlife, the results of the Nova Scotia Royal Commission on Forestry, which were released this spring, provide direction for the future. They recommend that wildlife and its habitat must be considered in all future forest management plans in the province. We consider this to be

very significant, because wildlife is being given greater recognition in the long-range management of our provincial resources.

Conclusion

In closing, may I extend to you my sincerest best wishes for a successful and enjoyable conference and associated events.

I believe that the theme of your conference--"Communicating about wildlife"--is challenging, and during the course of your discussions will probably bring into focus the significance of wildlife management, education, and public relations staff working more closely together as a team, to ensure that wildlife considerations receive a higher ranking when decisions are being made in a society that is very competitive for a stake in resource development and allocation.

I thank you again for this opportunity to welcome you to Nova Scotia, and I hope your stay is enjoyable and that you will leave with pleasant memories.

The Hon. W. Mathews
Minister of Culture, Recreation, and Youth
Newfoundland and Labrador

We are very pleased to participate in this conference. We have a fairly large delegation consisting of Frank Manual, Deputy Minister of the Department of Culture, Recreation, and Youth; Jim Inder, Assistant Deputy Minister of Parks, Wildlife, and Recreation; Dave Pike, Director of Wildlife; James Tessier, my Executive Assistant; and Dennis Minty, Information Education Co-ordinator.

I think this indicates our significance, and the importance that we as the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador put on our wildlife resources. We look forward to discussions and deliberations with other Ministers about common concerns and problems that we may have, as we go through this conference, and of course, we are looking forward to the social aspects of the conference.

Wildlife is most important to our people, and in particular our native peoples who depend on wildlife and game for subsistence. In our province we have what we consider to be an excellent wildlife management unit, and as a result our game populations are in a very healthy state. Of course, we are always striving to improve, and accordingly will be issuing a green paper to the people of our province, the general public, to get their feed-back--their impressions on how our wildlife management is going--and also to have their input into how we may improve our particular wildlife management.

We are expecting that this process will be very successful, as we have found in recent years that there is a greater public awareness, and I guess a greater degree of public co-operation within our province, particularly as regards wildlife management. So we are hoping this process again will give us some additional feed-back from the public, whereby we can be more efficient and effective, and consequently have a more successful and greater wildlife stock within the province.

So we do look forward to the next couple of days of deliberations and discussions with you.

The Hon. C. Maxwell
Minister of Parks and Renewable Resources
Saskatchewan

We are very happy to be here. Dennis Sherratt, Director of Wildlife, is here with me, and Alanna Koch, my Executive Assistant.

When the Nova Scotia Minister was making his comments he could have been talking about Saskatchewan. He was talking about farming, forestry, and wildlife and their significance to his province. Of no less significance are those areas, of course, to Saskatchewan.

With respect to wildlife there is one thing I would like to mention that we did in Saskatchewan this year. We passed a Critical Wildlife Habitat Protection Act, which places 500 000 ha under the act, meaning that they cannot be altered, cannot be sold, and will be preserved for wildlife.

The Minister from Newfoundland talked about the weather. I think I am the only Minister here who should be unaccustomed to the weather, coming from the Prairies. We, too, are looking forward to the social aspects of this conference. I do not know if that covers all the themes of the conference or not, Mr. Chairman, but I suspect it does not. However, I will now close my comments.

Update report

WILDLIFE HABITAT CANADA

D.J. Neave
Executive Director

About 6 months ago I asked to have a few moments on the agenda, as there appeared to be a few problems with the start-up of Wildlife Habitat Canada. These could be described perhaps as a lack of communication in defining the foundation's role and in establishing effective working mechanisms. Since I have been led to believe that these problems are primarily over, I am not going to dwell on the development of working relationships. Instead, I would just like to spend a few minutes making some announcements and discussing our activities in the next few months.

Firstly, I would like to introduce two members of the Habitat Canada team. Ken Cox is our National Program Co-ordinator. If any of you have ideas that you want to discuss with him, it would provide him with a great opportunity to meet you. The other individual is Wayne Roddick, our Communications Manager, who most of you have known during his career with CWS.

Secondly, I have sent out copies of the Annual Report on Wildlife Habitat Canada to many people, but there are other copies available.

A third point deals with a number of projects that we are doing internally at Wildlife Habitat Canada for which we require your assistance. We plan to meet with you personally at this conference to discuss three studies. If any of you have any suggestions I hope that you will contact us. The three internal studies are: a socio-economic evaluation of wetlands, a pilot program on a mortgage relief concept, and a review of the habitat components of the endangered species status reports published by the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada (COSEWIC).

A comment on the "Habitat conservation stamp". I believe that most of you have seen the stamp. If you have not, perhaps the best person to see is Wayne Roddick. The official release for the stamp is 1 August, and we are planning a Habitat Coalition Meeting on 31 July. We have sent a letter out asking for topics, and plan to discuss the implementation of a program for the non-governmental organizations' involvement in the sale of the stamps and the limited edition print.

Lastly, let me say that I have really appreciated the assistance and support from all of you in setting up Wildlife Habitat Canada. We have made some mistakes, but we are off and running. A special thanks has to go to our Chairman, Stew Morrison, who unfortunately could not attend the conference. I would also like to recognize two Board members who are here--Arthur Smith and Elmer Kure.

Update report

CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ENDANGERED SPECIES OF WILD FAUNA AND FLORA (CITES)

B. Tétreault
Director General
Canadian Wildlife Service

I am sure that most participants here are aware that the major event for CITES during the past year was the 5th Meeting of the CITES Parties held recently in Argentina. I would like to pass on to you some of the more important decisions of Canadian significance taken by the Parties in Buenos Aires, and some of the recommendations that have since been made by members of the Canadian delegation for future meetings.

In a nutshell, we were able to win on most points of Canadian interest, but lost the battle on Gyrfalcons and cranes.

Protection of animals

Of special significance to the industry, a resolution giving support in principle to a proposed "Convention for the protection of animals" was rejected by the Parties. Canada argued it was ultra vires to CITES, on the basis that endorsing an as-yet unwritten convention was a little like signing a blank cheque. The Parties agreed with Canada and declared the resolution ultra vires by a vote of 42 in favour and 5 against. The delegation members are extremely grateful for the support that we received from the non-governmental organizations (NGOs) on this special issue.

Cranes

Canada spoke strongly against the UK proposal to list all non-regulated cranes on Appendix II. In spite of our arguments concerning the absence of trade in the Sandhill Crane and its abundant population, the UK proposal was accepted by the Parties.

Hooded seals

A Swedish proposal to list hooded seals on Appendix II was strongly opposed by Canada on the grounds that the data presented were incomplete and outdated, and that the hunt of the species had been considerably reduced. New data and arguments presented by Canada convinced the Parties to reject the proposal by a vote of 19 in favour and 29 against.

Narwhals

As happened with hooded seals, West Germany's proposal to uplist narwhal from Appendix II to Appendix I was not supported by up-to-date biological and trade

data. New data presented by Canada, and arguments put forward by the Canadian delegation and Canadian indigenous people attending the meeting, convinced the Parties to reject the proposal by a vote of 21 in favour and 20 against, with 14 abstentions.

Gyrfalcons

Perhaps one of the most contentious issues for Canada was the Gyrfalcon. Despite the sound arguments put forward by Canada against the inclusion of North American populations of Gyrfalcons in Appendix I, the Danish-Norwegian proposal was approved by a vote of 28 for and 13 against. This means that trade in wild-caught Gyrfalcons for commercial purposes cannot be allowed. At a recent post-conference meeting of the delegation, the options open to Canada in the light of this unfavourable decision were extensively debated. It was decided that all provinces and both territories would be surveyed for their opinions on whether or not a reservation should be lodged by Canada against the Gyrfalcon listing. I understand that this review has now taken place. We have only until the end of July to place the reservation, if we decide to as a Party to the Convention.

High-volume trade species

At the past two conferences, high-volume trade species have been the subject of much debate. The delegation has identified at least 18 species for which up-to-date national status reports must be continually maintained. It is imperative that Canada be able to respond quickly to foreign proposals affecting Canadian species and to support current Canadian management practices for these species.

Reputation of Canada

We believe that, over the years, Canada has developed a good international reputation with respect to CITES, and is now well respected by the vast majority of the CITES Parties. For the next 4 years Canada will remain a member of the CITES Standing Committee--the committee that oversees the operation of CITES between conferences. In addition, Canada will chair the sub-committee responsible for the CITES live-animal transportation guidelines. However, perhaps most indicative of the esteem in which Canada is held was the overwhelming first-vote majority Canada received for its offer to host the 1987 CITES conference.

Canadian delegation

I firmly believe that one of the reasons Canada has been able to establish such an excellent reputation is the delegation that Canada has been able to send to the conferences. Without exception we have sent technically qualified, highly competent individuals able to convincingly present the arguments needed to sway other delegations to the Canadian point of view--at least, most of the time.

For this reason, I would like to mention several of the recommendations members of the delegation have made to me since the conference:

(1) First and foremost, we should continue and enhance the close relationship past delegations have established with NGOs. In fact, next time around we would like to initiate the consultation process even earlier than has been the case to date.

(2) As personality can play a significant role in the effectiveness of the Canadian lobby effort, some consideration should be given to establishing a system for impartially reviewing those nominated as observers before registering them with the CITES Secretariat.

(3) Preparation and distribution of technical material should occur well in advance of the international meeting.

(4) Canadian positions and concerns should be negotiated as much as possible before the delegation leaves home.

(5) The roles, expectations, and responsibilities of the Canadian delegation and NGOs should be discussed before they arrive at the international meeting.

(6) Canada must actively participate in CITES internationally during the 2 years between meetings.

(7) We must provide adequate support for the Canadian CITES program between international meetings.

(8) We must begin our homework on Canadian issues for the next international meeting now, including -

- Gyrfalcons,
- cranes, and
- marine mammals.

I shall close this long list of recommendations with what I and the rest of the delegation believe are the most important:

(9) Improved rules of procedure are a must. Better voting procedures, a change in structure of the meeting, and a more equitable debating procedure are needed. Of course, new rules of procedure can only be as good as the chair, and thus careful consideration must go into selection of a chairperson.

(10) External funding must be found for delegations unable to finance themselves. A recent and growing trend is the provision of outside funding for delegations, but unfortunately this is provided with strings attached. If delegations cannot vote freely, the credibility of CITES will be at risk.

If these two problems are not resolved, the well-being of this international agreement could very likely hang in the balance.

Conclusion

I believe that in hosting the 1987 CITES Conference, Canada will have a unique opportunity to explain to the other Parties our wildlife management techniques and philosophy. We expect over 70 countries and 125 national and international

organizations to be in attendance. However, if we are to be successful, we must be prepared, and that preparation must begin now.

Comments on CITES update report

K.A. Brynaert (Canadian Wildlife Federation) said that he was pleased to learn that the question of a reservation had been sent to the provinces for consideration. He suggested that there was a principle involved here that was important to all matters referred to in Mr. Tétreault's report. The Gyrfalcon issue was an example of a vote that was based solely on emotion; the scientific data presented by the territorial government was, in the view of any scientist that he had spoken to, conclusive, but the decision was against that scientific information. He suggested to the provinces that when consideration was being given to a decision on the reservation, it should be looked on as a principle. He thought that a reservation should be put forward.

G. Sheehy (Canadian Nature Federation) stated he was never satisfied that the argument that leaving the North American Gyrfalcon on Appendix II was not a threat to trade in European birds, which could be confused with North American birds or presented as North American birds in trade. He had read the background documents on the Gyrfalcon proposal, and they seemed to be well prepared and well written. He felt that the question was not black-and-white from the level of detail at which he had looked at it. He was still not convinced that the Canadian position was the appropriate one.

J. Berryman (International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies) spoke on the comment that Mr. Tétreault had made about the procedures and the financing of those governments that were unable to finance themselves. He said his association felt that these governments ought to have a place, but had the same concern about the NGOs' ability to influence the legitimate vote of the Parties that had come to conclusions by scientific and very open and public processes. He thought that his association would be asking the congress, which had already been asked by other organizations, for oversight hearings on this point. He stressed that the States certainly agreed with the concern that had been expressed and would join Canada in an attempt to solve it.

Update report

"NORTH AMERICAN WATERFOWL MANAGEMENT PLAN"

J.H. Patterson
Canadian Wildlife Service

It is a pleasure to announce that the "North American waterfowl management plan" in its first draft has been completed by the United States and Canada, and it has been distributed to all provincial and territorial Wildlife Ministers on behalf of the Minister of Environment. In the United States it has been distributed on behalf of the Secretary of the Interior to all of the states and members of the flyway councils.

Following the review and comment of Ministers and flyway councils, the plan will be revised by the Canada/United States Steering Committee in September and sent out for public comment in both Canada and the United States. Following that review process, the Steering Committee will finalize the plan in January/ February, and we are planning to have it endorsed by the Secretary and the Minister in March of 1986. This will be a formal agreement under the Migratory Birds Convention between the two countries.

The plan addresses waterfowl management and conservation issues of continental importance. It does not address everything that there is to know and do about waterfowl. It builds on the important programs in both countries, involving all levels of government and the private sector. It provides a framework for international co-operation on population and habitat issues of international importance. It has specific objectives for populations, habitat and strategies for achieving them. The plan has a 15-year planning horizon, and it will be reviewed and modified as necessary at 5-year intervals. The plan also calls for the creation of a North American Waterfowl Advisory Committee. This will involved federal, state, and provincial participants and it will oversee implementation of the plan. This is paralleled in Canada by the creation of the Canadian Waterfowl Advisory Council, which will have all provinces, territories and the federal government participating. We also look forward to considerable input and participation from the private sector.

The development of the plan in Canada represents a very key development in co-operative wildlife management. It had the full partnership of the provinces, territories, and the federal government, and it had considerable input all along from major non-governmental organizations. They were very constructive, very helpful, and I appreciate that. The timing of the plan is somewhat interesting. We have just come through a major drought in Prairie Canada that has substantially affected waterfowl populations. The Black Duck is showing signs of stress--it is declining. The issue in Alaska with subsistence hunting is out in the open. One could say that this is a difficult time to prepare a plan under those circumstances. I look at it the other way around--if the plan is going to be successful it will have to provide rational approaches to dealing with these problems and resolving them, so I look upon it as an opportunity to really develop a workable and realistic continental plan.

Acknowledgements

As I mentioned earlier the plan is a product of full partnership in Canada and the United States. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the members of the Canadian Steering Committee: Bob Andrews of Alberta represented the western provinces; Kevin Lloyd of the Northwest Territories represented the territories; and Doug Roseborough, retired from Ontario, represented the eastern provinces. At an earlier phase Bob Bell represented the Northwest Territories with those same members in preparing the "Canadian waterfowl management plan", including the roll-up of provincial action plans. I would also like to thank the provinces for the work they did in preparing regional plans that contributed substantially to the final product. I would also like to thank Bob Bailley, who is currently the Waterfowl Management Plan Co-ordinator, and Sandy Macaulay, who was with CWS for a year and a half and did a masterly job in helping to finalize the "Canadian waterfowl management plan". Also George Finney of CWS has been involved for some time and has been very constructive. Again I would just like to make the point that this truly has been a co-operative effort in Canada and in the United States.

Update report

FORESTRY/WILDLIFE SYMPOSIUM

D. Hagan
Ontario Wildlife Branch

Last year, our then Deputy Minister, John Sloan, committed us to the next Forestry/Wildlife Symposium, a successor to the one that was held in Vancouver in 1984. We are going ahead with that. We will concentrate particularly on boreal forest problems in this conference, and for this reason it will be held, we hope, in Thunder Bay, the hub of forest industry activity in northern Ontario. We have assembled a Steering Committee and think these people more or less agreed to being on it--the committee is headed by Tim Millard, our Executive Co-ordinator of the Outdoor Recreation Group; with Ken Armson, Executive Co-ordinator of Forests in Ontario; Larry Douglas, Director of our Policy and Planning Secretariat; Monte Hummel, President of World Wildlife Fund Canada; and Joe Bird, President of the Ontario Forest Industries Association.

Planned for 1987

The symposium will not be held until May of 1987. We have found that the work-load in organizing a gathering of this size and complexity is making it difficult and perhaps even foolish to attempt to arrange it sooner. Also, there will be a National Forest Congress in April 1986, which would compete for the interest and time of forestry staff both in Ontario and elsewhere. This delay will not slow the rate at which wildlife management considerations are going ahead in Ontario, and are being incorporated in forest management practices. We hope by the time that we have the conference we will have a lot of news for you on things like wildlife management guidelines in the boreal forest. Ontario is formalizing this process of negotiation and reconciliation at the forest operating plan level. We are very excited about this system.

Recently, also in Ontario, we have signed a Canada-Ontario Forest Resource Development Agreement which further recognizes the importance of multiple-use concepts, and over $500 000 dollars has been set aside to develop and demonstrate practices that promote integrated forest management; wildlife-related proposals can expect a reasonable share of these funds. As well, we hope by that time our provincial Environmental Assessment Act will be in operation with regard to forestry operations. There are many developments that are occurring in relation to this both in Ontario and elsewhere. The symposium will also give us an opportunity to tell one another of happenings and progress in our various jurisdictions.

I invite as many of you as possible to join us in Thunder Bay in May 1987.

Comments on Forestry/Wildlife Symposium update report

G. Sheehy (Canadian Nature Federation) pointed out that the Steering Committee did not have any federal representation. He suggested that, if it was not too late, Ontario consider adding someone from the Canadian Forestry Service (CFS) or the new Ministry of State for Forests. He explained that he had had some dealings with the new Minister and the CFS since it had moved from Environment Canada, and that wildlife had almost no part in their plans at present, and he felt that it really should have. He said that it might be serving the cause if Ontario would consider approaching the CFS or the new Ministry of State for representation on the Steering Committee.

Also, on the subject of wildlife/forestry symposia, which he felt were all really worthwhile efforts, he suggested that it would be really good if they could all work on something beyond the symposia. It was really important that they work with the recommendations of those conferences, and ensure that they were implemented in the interim between all the get-togethers.

D. Hagan (Ontario Wildlife Branch) thanked Mr. Sheehy for his suggestions. He also mentioned that there would be many other committees, i.e. an organizing committee, program sub-committees, etc. He said that, besides the Steering Committee, there should be lots of opportunity for people to participate.

Update report

FUR INSTITUTE OF CANADA (FIC)

R. Gilbert
Executive Director

Since your meeting in Timmins last year, a number of accomplishments have been achieved by the Institute, and my Chairman, Rich Goulden, has asked me to express his sincerest regrets that he is unable to personally make this presentation.

In 1984 we concluded an agreement with the Alberta government that would permit the establishment, at the Alberta Environmental Centre in Vegreville, of the world's most advanced trap development facility. I would like to report to you that this project is now well under way. We have recently hired a project leader, design engineer, and technician. One or two more staff will be added in the future. Holding and test pens are being constructed at our 2-ha test site, and a sophisticated video-monitoring system is being purchased. Laboratory and office space have been provided, and we are confident that by this fall the facility will be fully operational. Our priority is to develop a trapping system that would result in the taking of fur-bearers in the most humane manner possible.

On another research front, the FIC has just entered into an agreement at the University of Minnesota with professors John Tester and Ulysses Seal. With their dedicated team, these world-class researchers will carry out a program to examine the stress experienced by animals captured by live-trapping systems.

In recognition of the critical importance of trappers' education to the efficient and humane operation of trap-lines, we have created a formal committee, composed of trappers, to assess existing trappers' educational programs across Canada, and to recommend new and innovative programs to best utilize available resources.

In the area of public information, the most significant accomplishment in the past year has been the decision to hire a full-time chairman for our Public Information Committee. I am pleased to announce, for the first time publicly, that Kirk Smith, formerly Executive Director of the Canadian Sealers' Association, will shortly assume responsibility for the Institute's public information programs in Canada and abroad. Kirk is with me for this conference, and I hope as many of you as possible will take the opportunity to meet us before its conclusion.

The FIC produced, earlier this year, an informational exhibit and pamphlet outlining the aims and objectives of the Institute. The display exhibit was used for the first time at the highly successful Canadian International Fur Fair in Montreal. The pamphlet has been distributed widely in Canada, and in the United States and Europe. We have a number of other initiatives of this kind in the planning stage and hope by this fall to have more informational material available to our various publics.

Contacts with others

I am certain that you are all aware of how well supported we are--financially and philosophically--by the International Fur Trade Federation (IFTF). The Institute's

good friend, Arthur Frayling, is in the audience and I once again want to thank him for his continuing support. Rich Goulden represented the Institute at the last Annual General Meeting of the IFTF, and followed that with discussions at the Ecology Section, the public information group of the IFTF, at which time he explored possible future co-operative public information initiatives.

Representatives of the FIC recently attended the annual meeting in Regina of the Canadian Federation of Humane Societies. Our aims and objectives were outlined at that meeting. We believe our participation with such groups will lead to a fuller understanding of our problems, concerns, and efforts.

We have established a Canada-USA liaison group to explore common causes and develop co-operative programs with the US business, union, trapper, and fur management sectors.

The Royal Commission on the seal hunt, headed by Judge Albert Malouf, recently held hearings in Pangnirtung on Baffin Island. Representatives of the FIC were there and a presentation was made in support of the historical, cultural, and economic importance to the arctic peoples of the seal hunt.

Again on the public information front, two recent meetings will, we believe, have significant relevance to the future long-term communication efforts of the Canadian fur industry as a whole. In a meeting in Ottawa in late May, agreement was reached that the Fur Institute of Canada would play the lead role in preparing, by this fall, a costed communication strategy and plan that will recommend and outline a long-term, co-ordinated public and private sector approach to countering the campaign of the "animal rights movement" against our industry. Participating organizations at this very important meeting included the federal departments of External Affairs, Indian Affairs and Northern Development, and Environment, native groups, the retail and manufacturing sectors of the industry, the government of the Northwest Territories, trappers and, of course, the Fur Institute of Canada. The responsibility to recommend a sophisticated, national and international communication program was clearly put on our shoulders. We accepted this responsibility not lightly, but with a great deal of enthusiasm.

Earlier this month, and as a follow-up to the May meetings, representatives of the Institute spent 2 days meeting with some key political figures in Ottawa. We outlined who we were, and what our short-term efforts would be to design a long-term communication plan, and asked for their support for our actions. We specifically requested a moratorium on any new long-term government initiatives until this fall, when they will have the opportunity to review our recommendations. Support and understanding from this group of political leaders was gratifying.

Immediate future

The Fur Institute of Canada will soon produce its first Annual Report of operations, containing a full financial accounting and reports of our committees. While production of this report was delayed somewhat by the hiatus between my predecessor's departure and my appointment, our commitment is to produce such a document annually prior to each Annual General Meeting.

Among my priorities as Executive Director over the next few months will be the recruitment of funds, particularly for the area of public information. While we are well served by a number of our constituents, some, we believe, should contribute more. And some have yet to make that first major financial commitment necessary for the future well-being of the industry.

I will also be turning my attention to meeting our constituents across Canada--the trappers, fur managers, politicians, retailers, and manufacturers--to the degree possible. I believe it is vitally important for the Fur Institute of Canada to establish and maintain face-to-face communication with our broad-based membership.

I want to express appreciation for this opportunity to report to you, and I solicit your continuing support for our efforts on behalf of Canada's first industry.

Update report

CANADIAN WILDLIFE SERVICE (CWS)

B. Tétreault
Director General

I have been asked to give an update report on the work of CWS over the past year. As you are all probably aware, CWS was amputated of 22% of its resources on 9 November 1984. It was a shock for all of us, and since that time we have had to do a lot of rethinking with regard to our mandate. As a result, we are undergoing a reorganization and realignment of programs within CWS. I do not want to go into any details about what was cut, but will concentrate on what was accomplished this year, and then give a few comments on the main thrust of CWS activities in the future.

Environment Canada's perspective

Due to a change in administration, the advancement of quote "old" federal wildlife policy was put on hold. However, a new document on Environment Canada's "Perspective on the management of wildlife in Canada" was developed. The document reflects the new direction CWS must take after the announcement of the cuts. New initiatives are proposed as they relate to departmental responsibilities for migratory birds, threatened and endangered species, wildlife in national parks, and other international and national matters. A CWS action plan has been approved and will serve as guidance for the short-term operation of CWS.

Federal "Wildlife policy"

A new federal "Wildlife policy" is being developed, incorporating some of the new proposals and initiatives of the Department of Environment (DOE) "Perspective on wildlife management in Canada", and will serve to put the federal house in order in the light of new initiatives and co-operation with the provinces/territories and NGOs.

Wildlife Habitat Canada

A charter was obtained for Wildlife Habitat Canada and a Board of Directors was established. Programs, policies, and priorities for the Foundation were developed. Wildlife Habitat Canada was officially opened on 22 November 1984, and a new "Habitat stamp program" will be launched in early August. As you have already been given an update by Dave Neave, I will not go into any more details here.

Value of wildlife to Canadians

The Federal-Provincial Wildlife Directors' Committee agreed in 1984 to an in-depth analysis of the results of the "Survey on the importance of wildlife to Canadians". These three reports will be published within the next 9 months.

Endangered species

A new endangered species proposal is being developed in keeping with the changes needed as a result of our new orientation. We have produced a discussion paper on the DOE "Perspective on the conservation of endangered wildlife in Canada", which is currently being circulated to provinces, territories, and NGOs.

Polar bear studies

Specific studies of the influence on polar bears of ice conditions, of seal distribution and abundance, and of polynyas continued. Monitoring of the polar bear population continued, with some mark-recapture work in the area of polynyas.

A "Polar bear research agreement" for Foxe Basin, Hudson Strait, Hudson Bay, James Bay, Ungava Bay, and the Labrador Sea has been produced for consideration by the parties. We thank Manitoba for taking the lead in this co-operative effort.

Humane trapping

The Inter-departmental Steering Committee on Humane Trapping, with Environment Canada providing the chairmanship and the secretariat, met regularly to facilitate more efficient decision-making. An Executive Committee, with representatives from the departments of Environment, External Affairs, and Indian Affairs and Northern Development, and two native organizations,was established. A co-ordinator for humanetrapping was also established.

Environment Canada provided $395 000 to the Fur Institute of Canada as part of its commitment over 4 years of $1.5M, specifically for research and development of humane trapping systems.

Construction of a facility for developing and testing humane trapping systems began at the Alberta Environmental Centre at Vegreville, and it will be fully operational by the fall of 1985.

"North American waterfowl management plan"

The Canadian-American Steering Committee for the development of a "North American waterfowl management plan" has met five times over the last 7 months. Negotiations have progressed very well and the first draft of the plan has been produced. The initial plan is to provide the overall framework at the international level for joint waterfowl management, through establishing population objectives and proposing strategies that will resolve problems of international concern. This draft will be formally sent from the Minister and Secretary to the provinces, states, territories, and flyway councils in the coming days. Comments received from these management agencies will be incorporated into a draft to be released for public comment in September 1985.

Protocol

The Protocol amending the subsistence-hunting provisions of the 1916 Migratory Birds Convention was signed by Canada and the USA in 1979. It has not yet been

ratified by the USA because of opposition to very general wording. In order to achieve a new agreement, both countries have gone back to the drawing board by issuing a discussion paper that would be the basis for public consultation in the United States and Canada.

Latin-American program

This is now in its 5th year of operation. Discussions have been opened with Argentina that will allow technical exchange for work to be done in the Antarctic.

CWS sponsored a Canadian scientist to do studies related to the impact of fire on ecological systems on the Galapagos Islands.

A 2-year effort to list, classify, and evaluate each country's major wetlands in South America is being co-ordinated by the International Waterfowl Research Bureau (IWRB). The results were presented at the first South American meeting of IWRB in February 1985. "Letters of arrangement" have been signed with Brazil, Venezuela, Ecuador, and Peru.

Whooping Crane program

As part of the continuing effort to protect and conserve the endangered Whooping Crane, a Memorandum of Understanding was signed by Canada and the USA. A "Canadian Whooping Crane recovery plan" has also been drafted.

Conventionon International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES)

I had the honour to head the Canadian delegation at the 5th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties held in Buenos Aires from 22 April to 3 May. Members of the 13-member Canadian team included the Minister of Renewable Resources of the Northwest Territories, the Member of Parliament for Eastern Arctic, and representatives of Environment Canada, Government of Manitoba, University of Toronto, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, and Secretary of State for External Affairs.

In addition to the official delegation, approximately 20 people participated at the conference on behalf of Canadian NGOs, these being the Sierra Club of Canada, Animal Protection Institute of Canada, Hudson's Bay Company, Fur Institute of Canada, Inuit Tapirisat of Canada, Canadian Wildlife Federation, Fur Council of Canada, Native Council of Canada, Dene Nation, and Canadian Sealers' Association.

Six countries, including Canada, offered to host the 6th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties. Canada's offer was accepted by a majority vote during the first ballot. Therefore the next meeting will take place in Canada in 1987.

Import, Export, and Interprovincial Transport of Wildlife Act

A submission to Cabinet leading to an act has been drafted and will be submitted to the Department of Justice for legal drafting. Consultation with the provinces and territories will be continuing.

Future

In the next year or so, CWS will be undergoing a reorganization and realignment of programs in accordance with the new change in government.

Plans and programs

Some activities in the forefront will be the "North American waterfowl management plan", a new "Endangered species strategy"; development of a new federal "Wildlife policy", completion of a new agreement with the USA concerning the Protocol to the Migratory Birds Convention; preparation for the International Ornithological Congress to be held in Ottawa next year; finalization of an accord with Alberta; implementation of the Memorandum of Understanding with regard to Whooping Cranes; implementation of enhancement programs in co-operation with the provinces/territories for wood bison, swift fox, and Peregrine Falcons; establishment of three new migratory bird sanctuaries in the Arctic; continuation of establishing technical exchange and joint research and management programs on species shared by Latin American countries; hosting the 1987-88 RAMSAR Convention--to name but a few.

As a new direction is taking place, the Environment Canada theme of "shared responsibility" will stimulate more co-operation with provinces and territories and various NGS. We have already seen some of these new initiatives. We have just established a new "Wildlife toxicology fund" in co-operation with the World Wildlife Fund. Of course, our links with Wildlife Habitat Canada are well known. We anticipate a new partnership dealing with endangered species work. New accords will be signed with Alberta, Yukon, and Northwest Territories. Through the "Wildlife conservation colloquium", which will take place in November of this year, various alternatives for providing a variety of financial incentives to conserve wildlife and wildlife habitat will be examined.

Staff

Finally, I have enjoyed my stay with the Canadian Wildlife Service, but I will be leaving for 10 months to attend courses at the National Defence College in Kingston. The main purpose is to obtain a better comprehension of Canada in interfacing with other nations. Such training will allow for better preparation in handling Canadian issues and negotiations with other countries. I leave with the knowledge that the extreme dedication and determination of my staff will continue to drive programs forward in an excellent and efficient manner.

I believe very strongly that my staff have both a regional and national perspective in the operation of the organization, and I am sure that we have profited from some of the exchanges that have taken place over the last few years. For example, through executive interchange we have been able to profit from stimulating new ideas that made the Wildlife Habitat Canada Foundation a reality, and provided a good base for the discussions with the provinces, territories, and the United States for the drafting of a "North American waterfowl management plan".

The excellent rapport that we have been able to achieve with various NGO groups gives us a new perspective on partnerships in the future. The next few months

may be difficult for us all, but I am sure that the ultimate outcome will be a stronger Canadian Wildlife Service in the future.

Comments on the CWS update report

M. Prime (Nova Scotia Wildlife Division) said that it had been Nova Scotia's pleasure to work with Mr. Tétreault and experience his good leadership. He said that there certainly had been a lot of new developments, and he wished Mr. Tétreault every success in his new venture.

G. Sheehy (Canadian Nature Federation) said that it would seem to fit in with their theme, "Communicating about wildlife", if they had a recommendation to the federal government that CWS programs be reinstated--the ones that were cut. He also suggested that, as individuals, they could all work to communicate that message. He mentioned that the three Ministers had left the conference, but asked their staffs to persuade them to speak to the federal Minister. He imagined that they could carry an awful lot of weight in expressing their concern about the wildlife research programs that were cut, and the lack of programs to fill the gap.

Update report

US FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

D. Minnich
Deputy Associate Director, Wildlife Management

The United States Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS) has been involved in a number of major resource efforts of interest to Canadians since the last Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference.

Waterfowl management

"North American waterfowl management plan"

We have been working with CWS to develop a "North American waterfowl management plan" to improve our co-operative approach to the management of ducks and geese. An initial draft has been prepared to guide management actions where international co-operation is needed. For example, most North American duck production is in Canada, and this plan calls for joint ventures with Canada to protect and manage duck-breeding habitat in Canada as well as the USA. We are reviewing the plan for wider distribution, and hope to invite Mexico to become involved in the near future.

Stabilized hunting regulations

A 5-year program of stabilized season lengths and bag limits for duck-hunting regulations is being completed this year in co-operation with CWS and the Prairie Provinces. Data collected during this period on breeding populations and production, hunters' activity and success, factors affecting hunters' activity and success, annual and seasonal survival rates of ducks, inventory of breeding habitat, and recruitment rates of ducks nesting on the Canadian and US prairies will be analyzed to enhance our understanding of the relationship between regulations and duck population numbers. Particular attention will be paid to the relative roles of non-hunting mortality and the effect of hunting on duck populations. By 1986 we expect to release results of these studies, and reappraise our basic philosophies towards harvest management of ducks.

Black Duck management

The population status of Black Ducks continues to be of major concern in the USA. The January 1985 midwinter waterfowl inventory showed a 2% decline in the Atlantic Flyway and a 6% decline in the Mississippi Flyway from the 1984 Black Duck population estimates. These numbers show an 8% decline from the 10-year mean in the Atlantic Flyway but a more dramatic 38% decline in the Mississippi Flyway. From winter counts, the population is currently about 40% below that of the 1960s.

It is unlikely that the problems currently impacting the Black Duck can be resolved by understanding any single factor. Therefore, beyond our efforts to

better understand those factors influencing mortality, a comprehensive approach is needed to study other factors in greater detail (habitat associations, reproductive capabilities, physiological adaptations, etc.). Such studies should enlighten our understanding of the relationship between Mallards and Black Ducks. At present, the USFWS and CWS are developing a special studies plan for Black Ducks. This action plan will identify surveys, research, and banding needs, and co-ordinate future activities. We look forward to working closely with CWS to improve our knowledge and capabilities to manage Black Ducks.

Fishery resources

Fisheries policy

The period May 1984 through April 1985 was a time of both significant achievement and introspection for the Fishery Resources Program of the USFWS. During the course of the year the Service redefined its fishery resource mission. This took place in an environment of fiscal austerity and a general government-wide re-examination of the federal government's relationship with the states. The Service's new fishery mission focuses on four areas:

- restoration of depleted, nationally significant fishery resources,
- mitigation of fishery impairment caused by federal water development,
- management of fisheries on federal and Indian lands,
- maintenance of federal leadership in scientific management of national fishery resources.

These four areas of emphasis are not new directions for the USFWS. They simply indicate that the Service will henceforth concentrate its resources and capabilities to address those fishery resources for which it has a clear responsibility.

Great Lakes fisheries

In the Great Lakes, strong and long-standing efforts with Canada continued, as the state, provincial, and national governments focused on restoration of fishery resources, particularly lake trout. Sea lamprey control continues to receive high priority, along with resource assessment, artificial propagation, and law enforcement.

The first comprehensive "Great Lakes fishing report", based on the combined data of the national fishing and hunting surveys of CWS and the USFWS, has just been completed. The Great Lakes Fishery Commission, composed of both Canadian and American representatives, will issue the report at some time over the next few months. The report will contain data from both national surveys concerning anglers and their days of effort, expenditures, and popular species sought.

Salmon fisheries

International co-operation in management of salmon populations of the Pacific Northwest made substantial progress with agreement on a salmon interception treaty between the USA and Canada--17 Service hatcheries and related facilities are involved in salmon production for restoration and mitigation purposes on the Pacific coast.

In addition the USFWS is making a major effort for Atlantic salmon restoration throughout the New England States. The major international issue affecting Atlantic salmon restoration is the impact of the high-seas commercial fishery. Progress is being made to reduce this impact.

Endangered species

Listing

In the past year, the USFWS has listed 55 species in need of protection, down-listed three species from "endangered" to "threatened" status, and delisted four species, i.e. taken them off the list of endangered and threatened species.

In addition the USFWS has accelerated work on its Endangered Species Information System (ESIS), a computer data base that will make detailed biological, distribution, and administrative data on native endangered and threatened species available to any authorized person with a computer terminal. The system is planned to be operational in 1986.

Accelerated efforts to recover species have resulted in development and approval of 67 recovery plans for listed species (a 60% increase in the number of recovery plans). The USFWS has also established an "experimental population" designation for listed species that allows for greater management flexibility in reintroduction efforts and encourages state-federal co-operation. Further, the USFWS has worked with CWS to develop a "Memorandum of Understanding" that clarifies the responsibilities of the USFWS and CWS in Whooping Crane conservation and management.

Habitats

Increased emphasis on habitat protection

During the past year the USFWS has evaluated biological information on the needs of waterfowl and other migratory birds for breeding, migration, and wintering habitat. We have formulated a detailed plan to acquire or protect breeding waterfowl habitats in the prairies of our northern states, in the Mississippi Delta and Gulf Coast, in the central valley of California, and in the marshes of the East Coast, and elsewhere in our country to maintain healthy migratory waterfowl populations. We look forward to joining this program with Canadian and Mexican programs of a similar nature to protect waterfowl habitats in all of North America.

Wetlands conservation

To further emphasize the importance of wetland habitat protection, the USFWS is pleased to announce that the USA has initiated steps to accede to the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance Especially as Waterfowl Habitat. This reaffirms our commitment to wetlands conservation and will allow us to co-operatively aid other countries seeking to preserve their important wetland resources. We look forward to strengthened co-operation with other party nations in the Western Hemisphere, and especially with Canada.

Research

Black Duck population monitoring

The first year of an experimental aerial transect survey for Black Ducks in Atlantic coastal habitats was completed. Surveys were conducted by four USFWS crews (one pilot, two observers) flying separate surveys in the area from the New Brunswick border to Savannah, Georgia. The flyway total was 216 658, with a 95% confidence interval of between 205 000 and 228 000 birds. The results of this survey were satisfying in that a precise estimate of the 1983-84 population of Black Ducks wintering in coastal habitats was obtained for the first time.

Acid rain

Co-ordination between the USFWS' acid-rain research program and CWS continues. Specific co-operative efforts during 1984 and 1985 included routine exchange of research information on acid-rain impacts on fish and wildlife and their habitats over a broad range of subjects, such as mitigation liming, research, and the effects of acid precipitation on sensitive species, e.g. Atlantic salmon, inland fisheries, and migratory waterfowl. This exchange is particularly helpful to the "National acid precipitation assessment program" (NAPAP). Canadian scientists also played an important role in the US-Canada co-sponsored American Fisheries Society symposium on acid rain (August 1984). The proceedings of this symposium are in preparation.

A Canadian scientist-contractor participated in a workshop to develop a guidance document for co-operating states to use in developing their acid-rain mitigation liming, supporting research, and monitoring plans. The states of Massachusetts, Minnesota, New York, Tennessee, and West Virginia will be participating in the program beginning in 1985.

The New York Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit is involved in both extensive and intensive evaluations of lake neutralization as mitigation for acid rain. They are looking at means to restore fisheries in acidified lakes, ways to protect and enhance fish populations threatened by acid rain, and possibilities for implementation of operational liming as an interim management practice. The research is being conducted in the Adirondack Mountain region of New York State.

Caribou telemetry

The utility of a satellite telemetry system for caribou was tested and evaluated. In initial trials, caribou were successfully monitored under enclosure and field conditions, and detailed movements were acquired for one migration in excess of 1000 km, over some of the most remote land in the USA and Canada. This system is now operational with 10 transmitters already in the field. The USFWS is working closely with CWS and two provincial governments on this project.

Polar bear ecology

Several studies are under way concerning polar bear ecology. Over periods of 2 to 3 years, many individual polar bears travel the length and breadth of the Beaufort Sea, occupying activity areas of 130 000-260 000 km^2. Significant from a management point of view is the degree to which the USA and Canada share polar bears in the Beaufort Sea. Whereas mark and recapture data suggested that exchange of bears between Alaska and Canada might be as small as 5%, we now know that most bears occurring along our north slope spend considerable time in Canada. Last year alone, 14 polar bear maternity dens were found with the aid of radio-telemetry--12 of those dens were on the high arctic pack ice, remote from our shores. Recently completed analyses suggest that the polar bear population is little different now than it was in 1957, and there has been no significant upward or downward trend in polar bear numbers since 1972.

Whooping Crane deaths

Between 17 September and 4 November 1984, seven Whooping Cranes died from Eastern encephalitis virus (EEV). Two males and five females were lost, including a 16-year-old female from a breeding pair, and non-breeders from 1 to 5 years of age. An intensive effort to isolate and identify the causative agent of the Whooping Crane deaths was conducted by Patuxent Wildlife Research Center veterinarians, and veterinarians and biologists from the National Wildlife Health Laboratory, the Center for Disease Control (Fort Collins), the US Department of Agriculture National Veterinary Service Laboratory (Ames, Iowa), National Zoological Park, US Army (Fort Detrick), Maryland Department of Agriculture, and University of Maryland. Since November, when the disease was diagnosed, efforts have been underway to develop a program for prevention of future outbreaks. EEV vaccine provided by the US Army (Fort Detrick) produced good immune responses in preliminary tests with Sandhill Cranes and one Whooping Crane. Vaccination of the captive Whooping Cranes previously unexposed to EEV was conducted on 20 March. In addition, biological control of the mosquito vector of the disease will be attempted by personnel from the Maryland Department of Agriculture and US Army (Fort Meade) with assistance from the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center.

Fisheries research

The USFWS recently contributed new analytical methods to monitor lampricide treatments. In addition, a "sterile-male-release" technique is being evaluated as a possible contribution to the sea-lamprey control.

USFWS fishery researchers have also defined new temperature guidelines for production of lake trout. They also developed a new in-line water quality monitoring device for hatchery use. The Great Lakes National Fisheries Research Laboratory is preparing a "Lake trout habitat suitability index" model for the Great Lakes. The model will pertain to spawning habitat requirements for Great Lakes fish. Spawning is a limiting factor to the fish at this time.

Law enforcement

"Operation Falcon"

The USFWS has for many years worked closely with the law enforcement offices of all the provinces as well as CWS. One major wildlife investigation stands out in the co-operative efforts of our two countries to stem the illegal trade in wildlife. "Operation Falcon" began in the USA in 1981 as a covert investigation aimed at reducing the illegal take, sale, and transfer of raptors. By 1984 defendants were identified in 14 states and the countries of West Germany, Finland, France, England, and Canada. The Canadian investigation, centred in Ontario, began shortly after the US investigation. By the fall of 1982, it became apparent that both the Canadian and US investigations were not only aimed at the same species of raptors, but also involved many of the same defendants. Therefore, from late 1982 through today this has truly been a joint investigation and a successful one.

On 29 June 1984, in a closely co-ordinated enforcement effort, over 300 law enforcement offices from Ontario, British Columbia, Alberta, the Yukon, 14 states, and the USFWS served more than 70 search warrants on suspects involved in the illegal commercialization of raptors. Since that time an additional 19 arrest warrants were issued in Canada alone. In the USA some 52 subjects have been charged, of which nine individual cases are pending. The penalties handed out, so far, include more than $220 000 in fines, 2 years in jail time, and more than 42 years of probation. This investigation is still on-going and it is expected to reveal additional defendants both in Canada and in the USA.

In summary, these are some of the major developments in USFWS activities, many of which have been or are being conducted co-operatively with our Canadian colleagues. We look forward to continued co-operation and progress on major issues of mutual concern in the coming year.

Keynote address (1)

INTRODUCTION OF KEYNOTE SPEAKER

J.Y. Hickman
Past President, Canadian Wildlife Federation
Chairman

We are now going to continue on with our theme, "Communicating about wildlife". I am your chairman for this session. On behalf of the Canadian Wildlife Federation, its executive and members, I wish to express our best wishes to all participants and to the organizers for a very rewarding conference. I also would like to acknowledge the fact that our immediate President, newly elected, Don Hayden from Calgary, decided in the expediency of economics not to attend these sessions for two obvious reasons. One, our Executive Vice-President, Ken Brynaert, is attending, and two, Nova Scotia is my home province and it seemed only fair to the organization and those who belonged to it that we restrict our participation to those two. However, our President joins with me in extending our best wishes to the organizers of this conference.

I am quickly learning that in the position of Past President you are no longer introduced, you just do the odd introductions. In this case I have the honour this afternoon of introducing the Keynote Speaker. I should point out to you, as probably most of you know, that a Keynote Speaker sets the tone and theme for a conference of this nature, and he or she is the catalyst that puts the glue to the various positions brought forth by the individual delegates and participants during the period of the conference.

Our Keynote Speaker, Michael Halleran, has a working background in journalism. He has worked in both print and television media, and in the latter was for 12 years a producer of documentaries on resources and conservation for CBC television. He became a freelancer in 1980, and since then has worked for both federal and provincial resource agencies as a communication consultant. He is currently under contract to the British Columbia Wildlife Federation, which is that provinces's largest conservation organization. He is responsible for all communication, including the production of a quarterly magazine and a 13-week educational television series on British Columbia's resources. This is now the third time that he has addressed our Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference, the others being in 1977 in Winnipeg and in 1979 in Regina.

Keynote address (2)

COMMUNICATING ABOUT WILDLIFE

M. Halleran
British Columbia Wildlife Federation

The central message I have for you is that our only hope of securing, much less improving, wildlife prospects in Canada today rests with more intensive management. Public awareness of that fact is virtually non-existent. The public has not got the message that many wildlife populations will decline even with more intensive management, but will certainly perish without it.

I regret that it is also necessary to include the animal rights connection at this time, because these groups are succeeding in convincing the press, public, and politicians that modern wildlife management is unpopular and maybe unnecessary.

Given a more supportive public, we could be much more positive about the future. That is, were we permitted to apply the kinds of management that are needed, including provisions for habitat, wildlife populations in this country would be secure for generations to come. In fact, suitable programs could not only arrest the decline of given wildlife populations, but could enhance and increase their numbers in many cases. The public has not gotten that message either.

If nothing is done, I foresee a great wildlife tragedy coming in Canada. It will not happen through too much hunting or industrial abuse, because we can totally control one and greatly influence the other. It is more certain to be a tragedy of neglect. My expectations are that this tragedy will occur because the necessary management support, using that term in the broadest context, is not forthcoming. I see the wildlife agencies gradually losing more and more control over management decisions as the animal rights groups gain strength.

So this presentation proceeds from the firm conviction that intensive wildlife management is overdue in Canada; that it will likely be opposed by animal rights groups and others; and that only a very sophisticated and honest communication program will offset the campaigns of the animal rights people. Of course, you may live in a part of Canada where no such problems exist. If that is so, I envy you.

Era of intensive management

We certainly began the century with a classic form of extensive wildlife management in Canada. Wildlife resources were largely unregulated a century ago; we had legal market hunting, the trapping industry was flourishing, and sport hunting was virtually wide open. Things have really changed. Market hunting ended a long time ago, although we still have a viable guiding industry in many parts of Canada. The trapping industry did not destroy the fur resource in nearly 400 years of exploitation. Citizens' hunting has been perpetuated in most parts of the country. Big-game populations are in real trouble in some places, not too badly off in others, and amazingly abundant in a few. It would be safe

to say that, on average, big-game populations in Canada are all in need of more management but are still essentially intact. The same is certainly true for the fur-bearers.

Given the direction of our society currently, it has seemed inevitable that we would end the century with intensive wildlife management becoming quite widespread. We are now leading up to that and the other resource sectors--fisheries, forestry, etc.--are into it already. It is unopposed for the other resources, but is opposed for wildlife.

For some years, the process of integrated resource use has become more and more accepted as a formula for resolving land-use problems between renewable resource interests, and particularly in the West. In its most successful applications, integrated resource management has been based on the premise that some kind of trade-off process is essential in modern resource planning. Realization that trade-offs are a certain direction of the future usually comes as resource advocates abandon the traditional, but often futile, efforts towards maximization of their specific resource objectives.

Integrated resource management

Reaching this state of awareness requires a fairly high degree of management sophistication and an abandonment of what might be called the "me-first" principle. This principle usually fails anyway as advocates of a single resource objective come to realize that the maximization of one resource option can only be made at the expense of others. That is as true for one as it is for all.

The advancement of this planning process may also require an abandonment (or at least revision) of the notion that one resource is more "special" than the others, a kind of mind-set many resource managers acquire in their university days. Integrated resource management, in some quarters, has almost become a discipline of its own. Its success is usually dependent upon the various "special interests" being prepared to sacrifice a portion of so-called "maximum sustained yield" for consideration of all uses instead of a single use only. If it is nothing else, at least it is more ecologically based and certainly, in most cases, more fair.

There have been some spectacular successes with integrated resource management in the West, particularly in British Columbia. The process is still new enough that not too much standardization of procedure or even terminology exists, let alone published literature. It is still an "on-the-job" learning experience for most resource people, there being no courses on the subject currently offered at the academic level.

The absence of any courses of this kind means that foresters, biologists, and agrologists still have to first reject some of the specialized management techniques learned at the universities in favour of a more general approach to life's resource problems in the real world. Some handle it better than others, but I can observe that this response does not follow any particular pattern. Some foresters take to it naturally. Some biologists do the same. But the reverse is also true. Moreover, its successful application depends as much on the existence of certain social skills as on technical ones. Among these social skills, the most vital of all is communication.

Though I have said that spectacular successes have occurred with integrated use, the enthusiasm most of us feel for the process is based on its potential. We are all well aware that the process has many flaws. All of us who have promoted co-operation between resource interests, rather than the confrontation that used to be so widespread, have done so in the belief that it would be far more productive to resolve our problems by negotiation and trade-off rather than name-calling in the press. I still believe that.

I believe there will always be a place for the campaigning of a single-resource position, particularly when it is obvious that the other resource sectors refuse to accept the premise that we are all in this together. There could also be site-specific situations in which the value of one resource is so totally ideal that it really makes little sense to compromise it unduly for a range of other lesser uses that might be as well satisfied elsewhere. There are those who do not agree with me. There are a growing number who do.

Highest and best

Some examples of this situation might be a class-one winter range, so ideally located as to suggest that it be considered for its "highest and best use", in this case wildlife. But if that notion is to get any universal acceptance, then it must also be appreciated that when the "highest and best use" happens to be forestry or fisheries or range, the same situation should apply. That, of course, is where the trade-off element comes in. That is when one finds out whether the trading partners are really serious about solution-seeking or not.

Again, I must stress that communication is one of the most important elements in reaching successful resource trade-offs. I mean communication in the broadest sense, which means that each of the trading partners must be prepared to do a lot of listening.

On the west slope of the Rockies (and I suspect in all of Canada) there are still a lot of people who refuse to believe that the days of super-abundance are behind us. People attain this awareness at different stages in their lives as they encounter situations that verify the inevitability of the condition. Naturally, they react in different ways. For some, the news that all our renewable resources are fully committed (if not overcommitted) causes them to dig in harder and become more entrenched in their efforts to maximize a particular special interest. I am sure you have all encountered this condition.

In my experience, the more realistic, reasonable, and sophisticated individuals among the resource interests are usually the ones that opt for trade-offs. Conversely, it is the more militant, the more one-eyed, that cling to the pioneer-like traditions of "me-first" campaigning. Not all of these people are found in the resource industries. The more radical animal rights advocates and some environmentalists are in that latter category also.

Despite some earlier misgivings, I am not bothered about the prospects of resource trade-offs. They work far more often than not. But I must confess I did not anticipate that a willingness to co-operate and avoid confrontation would be regarded as a sign of weakness by other resource proponents, and would thus work to the detriment of the process. I did not perceive it but it has

happened. In advancing these negative sentiments, the media have been a deciding, destructive factor. It has become apparent that in many resource conflicts in which media have played a major role, that process has benefited media more than resources.

Truly in-depth reporting benefits the process, but the more sensationalist "he said - she said" kinds of reporting, much of which is often distorted to accent the dramatic, is unproductive or worse.

Common ground

In my work in British Columbia, and for the last several years, I have been a continuous advocate of improved relations between all resource managers and users. This is particularly true for fish, wildlife, and forestry. Since British Columbia is a forested province, nothing could be more natural than fish, wildlife, and trees occurring naturally together. So when we seek closer association with other forest users, we are quite literally talking about common ground.

It's great. I love it. I am one who experienced the confrontationist 60s. As a media professional in those days, with a strong commitment to conservation, I often used my media voice to sound public warnings about the dangerous trends on which many of our resource programs were based. That turned out to be a fairly dangerous thing in itself. Any reporter who made strong public statements in defence of wilderness, parks, wildlife, wild rivers, and the like, and who put a little heat under single-use advocates like hydro and mining, could expect organized and remorseless retaliation.

When the chance came to exploit some new systems and develop that concept of common ground to which I refer, some of us jumped at it. I have never been sorry. The climate between renewable resource interests in British Columbia is now better than it ever was. But when it comes to wildlife in particular, I see that process starting to slip. I think we must now face the reality that, for largely the same reasons in all parts of Canada, the cause of wildlife management is more and more likely to fail because it is so inadequately supported that it cannot succeed.

There are many instances that illustrate that point. Our national government can see fit to help fund a maze of provincial programs in forestry, range, and fisheries, but not wildlife. Considering the recent treatment of our national wildlife service, it would seem that we still have a lot of convincing to do. Members of Parliament have shown they are willing to be swayed by "save the seals" and other similar campaigns of the animal rights people. But the calls for improved levels of care--of management--for all wildlife have gone largely unanswered.

Unfortunately for us and the cause we serve, public support for wildlife programs is not expanding. Instead, in many ways it seems to be in decline. The loudest proponents of wildlife advocacy in the nation are calling for less management not more; thus refuting the case for management itself and its legitimacy as a social and scientific practice. The anti-trappers and anti-hunters are becoming highly successful "headline hunters". Some of them may have a strong commitment to wildlife, but a very distorted view of what is needed to protect it.

Missing the story

My references to the media are not based on any lack of support for the concept of a free press, but on the grounds that in reporting only the most dramatic aspects of the wildlife debate, the press has caused the public to miss the main story. The outrageous acts and irresponsible outbursts of the wildlife "rights" people simply make better copy. They sell more papers and television advertising than would stories about successful management programs.

In some parts of Canada the media appear to be totally on the side of the anti-hunters and anti-trappers. Pro-hunting or trapping stories are just about non-existent. Much of the stuff that is on television is so distorted as to be embarrassing to anyone who actually understands wild animal behaviour.

The anti-hunters claim to be acting out of a sense of commitment to wildlife. There are many hunters and managers who dedicate their lives to the same end. But the anti-hunters and others in the "protest industry" dismiss all I have done. They dismiss all you have done. I envy them their childish simplicity. There is a long list of industrial options that pose a threat to wildlife management. To that list we must now add the protest industry as well.

Across North America, the impact of a century of hunting has been well documented. The white-tail deer is more abundant now than it was 75 years ago. The same is true for elk, antelope, and mule deer, at least in the West. Black bears and beavers have increased to pest status in many parts. I admit there are problems with some species in some areas, but nothing that more intensive management would not fix.

The public expenditures for wildlife are another tragic commentary on the lack of popularity of wildlife management programs. In British Columbia, where overall annual provincial expenditures are about $8 billion, less than $8 million is spent on wildlife management. But listen--the amount taxed from hunters by licence or other fees is greater than that spent on wildlife management. In other words, the provincial government's expenditure on wildlife in British Columbia is just about zero. In that province at least, hunters pay for wildlife management; everybody else, including the anti-hunters, gets it for free.

Populations of wildlife are not getting the kind of management they deserve and need, and the anti-hunters and animal rights groups are succeeding in making wildlife management politically unpopular.

This whole situation raises the spectre of management-by-lobby. As it becomes more successful, it means that resource managers (of whatever kind) must be forced to follow the dictates of the strongest lobby instead of the science-based teachings of their own profession. In any resource situation, when the lobbyists call the shots, the managers lose their ability to manage. We are all sensitive to the dangers of big industry using lobby power to set public resources at risk. It is no less dangerous when done by a radical environmental group. The radical lobbyists can demand with impunity. They need never fear the consequences of their actions. They have only their own narrow self-interests to consider. They are not accountable.

I stand before you defending scientific resource management as opposed to management-by-lobby. That does not mean that I feel perfectly comfortable with

everything the managers tell me. Far from that. I am not totally convinced that applied, intensive management is the automatic solution to our wildlife problems. In the long run it is likely to have as much to do with ethics and the consciousness of people; the acceptance of an attitude of stewardship. But in the absence of that, and ideally in addition to it, the management route is the essential course to pursue. We tie the managers' hands when we lobby down their programs. We tie their hands when we leave them to operate with inadequate funds.

Animal rights vs. management

If one is to take a reasoned approach to these problems one must be informed on the genesis of the animal rights movement and the anti-hunting movement, which now combine to represent the greatest threat to legitimate wildlife programs today. It is bitterly ironic for those of us who have made wildlife management our life's work, that those from whom we have the most to fear are those who profess to "care" more about wildlife than we do. Very obviously we must better define the imperatives of intensive wildlife management and the certain difficulties we face in attempting to obtain the legislative support we need in order to secure it.

There seem to be elements of collective guilt manifest in the campaigns of the animal rights people. Aware of the nasty hazards of group type-casting, I want to offer some common denominators that seem to exist among them. Most seem to be under 30. Most seem to spring from the cities not the soil. Most are aware that wildlife circumstances, along with general environmental conditions, have been drastically impacted by the doings of industrial man. Lastly, most are aware that socially outrageous acts, if not illegal ones, often attract more media attention than passive protest or work on positive wildlife projects. Most are aware that the press will be unable to resist covering any spectacular staged for their benefit.

There are some who naturally flock to any cause that seems to offer hope of a high profile or publicity. It would be nice to think that the wildlife movement was free of such people, but we all know that it is not. We have even seen evidence that some politicians will try and use this public sentiment to their own advantage. I find this especially distasteful.

The whole process saddens me greatly. I have spent my working life attempting to secure a broader public support base for wildlife--for the whole spectrum of conservation philosophy. Now I find myself having to direct vast amounts of energy towards the actions of people who claim to have the same objectives as I do--a better deal for wildlife. I am afraid that many have oversimplified the problems to the most ridiculous extent, perceiving a hunted population as automatically threatened and an unhunted population as automatically secure. Apart from the obvious statistical realities, that hunted species are doing better than many unhunted ones, this whole premise virtually ignores the vital habitat connection.

Many of the animal rights people whom I have talked to seem to have the view that if we are "managing" wildlife, we are somehow "bothering" them; that we are forcing them to do things they would otherwise not want to do. Most fail to realize that concern for wildlife (in most parts of Canada) is best manifested in

applications of more management not less. That is not the message of the animal rights people. That is not the way it is in Disney's "Wonderful world of colour".

Use needs management

The success of the anti-seal people has only meant that we are about to see the same kind of assault aimed at stopping trapping--it is already happening. I have always been suspicious that it is not a so-called "humane trap" they seek but an end to trapping itself. There is no question that drastically negative social consequences would certainly result from any ban on trapping in Canada, where today there are thousands of families, Indians and others, depending on trapping as an important source of family income.

As it is with the hunting connection, wildlife use demands wildlife management. In the face of growing industrial advances, more intensive management is required. We have proven that species being trapped and hunted can withstand quite heavy levels of use if properly managed. The fact that (for the most part) hunted or trapped species are doing quite well does not seem to deter. Beware the pitfalls of oversimplification. Wildlife management has become a vulnerable science. It is quite imperfect in many ways, dealing with so many unknowns and variables. It is therefore easy to point out its shortcomings even if one is a rank amateur and, if one is so inclined, to capitalize on them.

Wildlife management often has to ignore the plight of individual animals in order to better ensure the welfare of the population. Here we encounter the fundamental difference between a wildlife manager and an animal-rights advocate. The application of "greatest good of the greatest number" is often the only option the manager has time for. If your concern is for individual animals, then it will not satisfy you. And if you are seeking ways to attack the process, those features make it vulnerable.

All management programs must be based on the standard that the welfare of the population--the species--is more vital than the plight of individual members of that population. With wildlife populations, the death of individuals does not automatically herald the subsequent death of the population or the species. In fact, it may indicate just the opposite. This situation becomes especially apparent with regard to so-called predators. We can have too few wild animals. We can also have too many. Attempting to reach the equilibrium is a process called "management".

In British Columbia today, we are currently having to deal with a powerful ranching lobby whose objective is to reduce the numbers of certain animals "competing" with cows. I have never heard of a case of animal rights groups coming to the defence of wildlife in such an instance. For the most part, the same is true of virtually all habitat threats.

Working examples

I would like to use another ranching analogy to demonstrate a working example of the case of individual animals vs. the whole population. I take you to a typical British Columbia mountain ranching situation on one large ranch that I know very well. The fall roundup on that big ranch goes like this: the country is vast, access is poor, limited only to horse travel; a rider begins a day's gather with

a few cows; as the day goes on, he picks up more and more; he could have as many as 200 by noon or as few as 30.

Many factors such as marshy ground, dense timber, steep terrain, can make it very difficult to get control over these animals. After a summer in mountain or alpine ranges, they may be more wild than tame. For various reasons, individual animals quit the bunch. They turn back, remembering the green fields of summer, or the image of a lost calf, or perhaps having gone home by a different route last year. The rider would no doubt make an effort to bring them back into the bunch, but in the interests of the majority he would eventually have to let them go. In some settings, such as high mountain pastures, leaving them behind is like a death sentence. They winter-kill (a euphemism for starving to death) or the wolves kill them; a very few might make it through to spring or find their own way home, which is unlikely.

All this could very well say something about the "cruelty" of mountain ranching. Perhaps the animal rights people will discover this some day. But our practical cowboy has made a conscious management decision--a value judgement--based on logic and on-site information. The question of town-type morality does not even enter into the equation at all. His objective is to get off that mountain with the largest population of healthy cows that he can; knowing that some members of that population may well perish as a result. Concern for the population as a whole should not be seen as lack of concern for specific individuals.

The resource observer (as opposed to the resource manager) does not have to make these kinds of choices, so is free to condemn them.

Large animal transplants to new habitats are another example. Even following careful study to determine that the new habitat has the elements needed to satisfy the requirements of the species concerned, one has to be prepared to accept some losses. Animals can be injured in capture or transport or upon release. This is weighed against the advantages of being able to establish a new population, an obvious advantage to the species. So what do you do? You plan as carefully as you can and then you go for it. Your supporters will applaud you for your efforts. Your critics will accuse you of playing God.

So we must all seek ways to convince the public that in virtually all of Canada today, extensive wildlife management--the simple opening and closing of seasons, regulating the harvest, and relying on "natural vigour" to see the "critters" through--is no longer enough. The pressures of industrial and human expansion, quite apart from any hunting or trapping that goes on, simply demand that we manage more intensively in order to compensate.

How sad and gloomy the prospects seem to be. We stand having to convince the public that "intensive" management is past due, when many of them are being told that management itself is undesirable or unnecessary, and simply "letting them be" would ensure their futures. You and I know that this is nonsense.

It seems obvious that our worst sin, as advocates of management, is that we have concentrated too much on the techniques of management and ignored the need to gain public support for them. Now, when we need those programs the most, they are being called into question as never before. I now move to the closing section of my presentation and the discussion of those points relative to the

vital theme of your conference--the need to be more effective communicators about wildlife.

Communicating and communicators

It is obvious that the anti-management advocates are besting us at getting their message across. Regardless of how you feel about British Columbia's infamous wolf-control program, it is obvious that spectacular media seduction is more likely to produce headlines than thoughtful, even well researched, management programs, particularly on highly controversial issues like predator control.

The British Columbia Wildlife Federation, which organization I serve, has in the past year worked on about a hundred, hands-on enhancement projects for fish and wildlife. These have included such things as habitat improvement (even some outright purchase of habitat, along with some assistance from Habitat Canada and other organizations), winter-feeding programs for big game, transplants of big game, and various fund-raising programs, some of which have put together amounts in the tens of thousands of dollars. The list is endless.

The media--for the most part--yawned their way through them all. But I believe that the public, the ordinary citizens, are not so bored by success stories in fish and wildlife management. All the while, anti-hunting and anti-trapping stories abound. The answer to me seems obvious. Since it is apparent that the media will not, on their own initiative, seek out a more balanced coverage of wildlife stores, we the wildlife management advocates--agency and otherwise--must take the initiative ourselves.

Some industries in the resource field, particularly those with a shaky public image, consider that between 5 and 10% of overall operating costs should be spent on advertising. For some it is even higher. For the most part, wildlife management agencies expect news media to do their communicating for them. This "communication by press release" usually says more about the political side of management than the practical side. The "Vancouver Sun", I digress to remind you, is the second largest English-language daily in Canada. I worked for the "Sun" for a while. I can remember days when we would get 50 press releases in the press room in one day - 50! Nobody ever read them all. We threw most of them away. Most of them deserved to be thrown away.

I suggest you assess the portion of your own agency budgets now allocated to communication as opposed to the other aspects of management. You will certainly find that spending more money on public information programs will mean that you might have to hire one less biologist or one less conservation officer. Maybe it is "conversation" officers that you really need--the kinds of people who will make it easier for your other employees to do their job.

You may have to find ways to mobilize support from your client groups in the public sector. The provincial counterparts of the British Columbia Wildlife Federation exist in every Canadian province--use them! The national parent body, the Canadian Wildlife Federation, can provide a national perspective. They can do the direct, out-front campaigning if you are unable to do so.

In British Columbia, the Wildlife Federation has its own television series. We program 13 original half-hour television programs per year on the provincial

educational television network. The programs deal with all aspects of renewable resource management. We program wildlife matters, but also fisheries, range, and forestry, as well as public recreation and general land use. We do not throw video spitballs at people. We do responsible, in-depth programs that tell people about the state of the resources they depend on. Counting repeats, we are on the air 39 weeks per year--prime time--and we reach hundreds of thousands of people. The audience runs around 200 000 homes per program.

Maybe you should try for television access of a similar kind in your own area. If you want "samples" of our programs to interest prospective network support, we would be happy to loan you copies of our programs. I think it would be really exciting to think about organizing a national resources television network across the country, utilizing the broadcasting facilities of provincial educational television systems. They are out there now and most of them are looking for program material. Exchange programs of this nature are already done on other subjects in Canada; why not wildlife or other natural resources?

Let me ask you what efforts you have made to impress Canada's national television network, the CBC, that wildlife management across Canada deserves more than "conflict" coverage. If the CBC can devote a weekly network show to agriculture, then why not at least a mini-series on wildlife?

The same kinds of approaches should be made to the print media. The British Columbia Wildlife Federation produces a quarterly magazine ("BC sportsman") which has a circulation between 25 000 and 30 000, in which we state our own case regarding resource conservation. News media will not provide this coverage as a public service. News is not a public service. There is a glut of national brochures on forestry and fisheries across the country, but virtually nothing on wildlife.

High profile

In the face of intensive, publicly staged protest about the way wildlife is being managed in Canada today, there must be some high-profile response. At the moment there is largely none.

The modern conservationist must be a realist too. We must all be aware that in a country with a totally open-ended growth ethic, where progress is measured in miles of new highway or industrial jobs or hectares under the plough, the case for wildlife demands and deserves more profile than it's getting. No one can give you any guarantees that your cause--the cause of wildlife security--will be given any more consideration in future than it has in the past. Unless you work personally and forcefully towards that end, it will never happen.

I do not want to leave you with the impression that I am too smug about the British Columbia situation. Much of what I see in "mega-project province" simply terrifies me. But even though the net public expenditure for wildlife in British Columbia is nil, we are still making some progress. The Wildlife Federation is doing it by using hunters' money for management and habitat. We do it with sportsmen's groups who volunteer thousands of hours of work to take on wildlife (and fisheries) projects. We fund a lot of programs that government refuses to fund.

As a result of these situations, something very strange is happening. New alliances are emerging. The guides and the trappers are beginning to work on joint projects to protect that "common ground" I spoke about. We are getting encouraging, even enthusiastic, response from the forestry community. There may be differences among us about how the pie is divided, but there is no room for differences about doing a better job with the land base and a better job of management. Our enemies, our detractors, create the climate for these new alliances.

We do not have to say goodbye to hunting, guiding, and trapping in Canada in order to preserve wildlife. What we have to do is face our common detractors with a united, reasonable, and common voice. Collectively we will have greater success at staving off the attacks of our opponents. And collectively we can make a more powerful defence for habitat and those other considerations vital to wildlife in Canada.

I leave you with this: yourselves and your agencies are the managers, but you are also the official custodians of a truly precious part of our national legacy--the great wildlife populations of Canada. In their great diversity and uniqueness they are known and prized throughout the world. This resource deserves much better than it is getting. I have made the task of increasing its public support my working priority, and I hope you make it yours.

Keynote address (3)

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

J.Y. Hickman (Session Chairman) suggested that intensive wildlife management, by its very nature, had brought about emotional human conflict. He asked the Keynote Speaker if he felt that some of the news media generally aggravated the situation, or that they merely quickly brought into focus the latent issues and arguments that had been lying relatively dormant in the minds of the non-managing public. He asked, in other words, whether the press were real culprits, or whether the issues were there and they were just bringing them into focus for people to resolve among themselves.

M. Halleran (Keynote Speaker) replied that, first of all, he could say as a 20-year veteran in journalism in both print and television, and not only in the resources field but in the daily news field--crime reporting, legislature reporting, and so on--the constant media response that they did not have enough information to tell the story any other way was substantially a cop-out. But, in defence of individual reporters, he pointed out that for the most part they were not given opportunities to specialize in resource-related subjects, either in forestry, fisheries or wildlife, or any of the others. Those resources, particularly in the West, were taken for granted because, in many instances, the editors and publishers of major daily newspapers, not to mention major television network operations, or even regional operations in television, were unschooled in what resource management dependence was all about.

There was no point at all, he continued, in attacking what an individual reporter wrote unless one could see that the reporter had consciously done a sloppy job. The problem rested with the fact that they themselves, as resource advocates, had not impressed upon the media that they were missing a golden opportunity for really good stories by not finding out more about what was going on in the resource field.

J.Y. Hickman said that he had been on both sides of the fence, having been a long-time private manager of wildlife and also in the wildlife movement, in attempting to improve the status of wildlife in this country. Mr. Halleran had mentioned somewhere in his address that the hunters at least paid for their privilege of hunting through, he presumed, licence fees, etc. He was curious as to whether Mr. Halleran felt that hunters today were paying their proper share. He was well aware that they bought food, transportation, clothing, equipment, and accommodation, but that in itself was a reward. In other words, if they were going to eat they were going to eat, and it did not matter whether they were hunting or staying at home. But he wanted to know whether through the licence fees themselves--as these were generally known in Canada and British Columbia--they were paying enough? He recognized that everybody who went hunting and fishing did not necessarily come home with any game. He was thinking particularly of this province of Nova Scotia, where they had an annual deer kill in the vicinity of 40 000 animals (legal). The licence fee for big game in Nova Scotia was $15, but he would not put a value on the deer, as he did not shoot deer himself. He wanted to know if Mr. Halleran thought that hunters were paying enough.

M. Halleran considered that the best way to answer that question was to point out that in British Columbia they had a surcharge of $3 on hunting licences and guiding and trapping licences. It was there because the Wildlife Federation advocated that it be there. That money was diverted specifically for habitat management and enhancement. As far as the $3 surcharge was concerned, the federation that he worked for was trying to raise it to $5. He could not tell exactly what the average hunter in British Columbia spent on a hunting opportunity, but their system was a little different from that in Nova Scotia. Out in British Columbia a licence cost $10, and then they were charged for each individual species that they required: to hunt elk was so-much, moose so-much, grizzly bear, etc. He knew of many people who were putting out $100 a year for a licence to hunt, and some of them thought that was enough.

They had also attempted to have established something along the lines of the Pittman-Robertson Fund--maybe they should try to accomplish that at a national level--where a tax on sporting goods was ploughed back into habitat management. The migratory bird surcharge that was coming up to help finance Habitat Canada was a good idea. He thought hunters were willing to pay more. However, they wanted to see the money go into the resource, not into any provincial government's general revenue, with the governing ending up paving highways with it or something like that.

K.A. Brynaert (Canadian Wildlife Federation) said that the speaker had made a point regarding the animal rights movement--about the spectacular media events that they created. One of the difficulties experienced, and perhaps Mr. Halleran could give some guidance, was the fact that rarely, if ever, was there any response to those events. They were able to make their outlandish statements on the seal hunt or whatever, and one just did not hear a response to that. He was not that critical of the news media, but the fact was that they were presenting an unbalanced story. The Wildlife Federation was looking at the proposition of providing names of people who would come forward to the press to present the other side of the story. He thought that was one of the areas that they had really been neglecting.

M. Halleran said he did not disagree with that. It was appropriate, but he had said near the conclusion of his talk that it was obvious that the news media were not going to do their communicating for them. Therefore, they were going to have to find ways of achieving that themselves--that was the best way to go about it. He gave the message of "fire in the forest" as an example. If ever there was a case of a resource message being carried to every level of the community, that was probably the best example that he could think of.

The salmonid enhancement program in British Columbia was a massively funded federal-provincial exercise. Everybody in the province knew about that program. It was not because the media told the story. It was because the people who were supporting the program and campaigning for it set out to sell it to the citizens, and that was what they themselves had to do. If they did not find ways to achieve that, whether through hiring a consultant or forming some sort of national communication alliance--there were all kinds of things that they could do--but if they did not do something, they were going to end up managing wildlife on smaller and smaller units of ground, and the real, basic scientific decisions were going to be taken out of their hands; they would be disenfranchised.

He did not think that this was acceptable, because the resource deserved more. The media were going to do their thing. He did not think it reasonable or legitimate, perhaps not even fair, to assume that the media should be instantly converted to their own point of view. Let them go ahead and do their thing but, in addition to that, the wildlife management supporters, governmental organizations, and public organizations had to become better communicators themselves. His group were reaching 200 000 homes a week in British Columbia with positive resource management programs. They were not pap and were not watered down by some ponderous editorial committee. He had total editorial freedom in the production of those television programs, as he did at CBC years ago, and that was the way they were produced.

They did not take sides in those programs on who should have this wood and who should have that range land or wildlife. They talked about the resource: what the impact on the resource was; what was happening to salmon in British Columbia, or moose, or elk, or trees, or top soil. Those were the fundamental questions. Eventually, he was sure, the message that they themselves were a serious, long-term presence in the wildlife discussion would start to filter through. It was not going to happen overnight, but they had staying power and credibility; they had organization and a certain amount of science on their side. They could also point to some successes. All they had to do was get motivated.

D. Minty (Newfoundland Information and Education Co-ordinator) was intrigued with the use of Mr. Halleran's term "video spitballs". His impression was that they were a fairly good communications technique. Certainly advertising companies and all Canadian corporations used them. They seemed to be trendy for today's use. He thought that they in wildlife should perhaps be using them as a medium a little bit more.

M. Halleran commented that the most used bit of wildlife communication on television was that CWS series of 60-second and 30-second spots called "Hinterlands who's who". He did not like the droning narrator's voice, but they were used a lot. One of the reasons was because they were visual and inoffensive, they had something to say, and television stations all over the country could use them when "Brown Brothers' Ford" cancelled their 30-second spot and something had to be stuck in there at the last minute. They could all be doing the same kinds of things in a slightly different way, and it was going to be tried in British Columbia, with himself producing three 30-second commercials on wildlife conservation. These were then to be handed out to the television stations to see what they would do with them. He was not going to offer to buy TV time because he could not compete with the cigarette companies and the car ads, but would make them available and see whether they used them or not.

He thought that was an appropriate method and not an insulting "me first" kind of message--the stuff he had said he did not program. The resource would sell itself if they could get it into a level of profile where people could see it. They had had enough successes that they could point to and demonstrate that they could get the job done. Many of the hunted wildlife populations in British Columbia were increasing; elk populations were increasing to a level where people in the local communities were telling them that they had got to control them because there were too many. Beavers and grizzly bears were doing really well

in British Columbia. They had problems, of course, but had demonstrated that they could make it work. Those were the kinds of things that they ought to be transmitting, those positive messages rather than the attack side. His personal feeling was that they should let Watson and Greenpeace go ahead and do their thing. He would not engage in a public debate with them. He had been invited to and had refused.

Panel: Communicating about wildlife (1)

INTRODUCTION OF PANEL MODERATOR

J.Y. Hickman
Past President
Canadian Wildlife Federation

The second half of this session is a panel entitled "Communicating about wildlife with other resource-users and decision-makers".

Our moderator for this panel, Dr. Donald G. Dodds, was born on a farm in the State of New York. After various jobs as a trucker, salesman, nursery labourer, and farm labourer, he entered the New York State College of Forestry in 1949. He transferred to Cornell University in 1951 to begin studies in science, education, and wildlife.

In 1953 he accepted a position with the Province of Newfoundland, and completed his MSc research on moose in 1955. During that year he became Newfoundland's first district biologist and, working with Capt. Harry Walters and Douglas H. Pimlott, helped develop the province's wildlife program. Meanwhile, studies on Newfoundland's snowshoe hare earned him a PhD from Cornell in 1960. That same year he was named Big-game Biologist for Nova Scotia, later becoming Assistant Director and Acting Director of Wildlife. He assisted the late Clarence Mason and Mr. van Nostrand and others in organizing the Department of Lands and Forests' Wildlife Division, and accomplished the original work leading to deer zoning for the province and the renewal of the moose-hunting season in 1964, following its closure in 1937.

At Acadia University he established the wildlife and animal ecology program, becoming its first visiting professor in 1961 and its first full-time professor in 1964. Both he and Austin Smith have since graduated some 30, probably 50 now, masters and several honour students in wildlife management. In 1975 he was named Dean of Science of that university. He has authored some 50 professional papers and numerous newspaper columns, short stories, and articles. His book, "Wild captives", was published by Macmillan of Canada in 1965.

In addition to all those things that I have just enumerated, he has found time to be a Director for the Canadian Society of Wildlife and Fisheries Biologists. He was co-founder of the Atlantic Section with D.S. Wright. He was the Northeast Section Chairman of the Wildlife Society, Chairman of Nova Scotia's Resource Council, a Director of both the Canadian Association of Human Environment and Oxfam of Canada, and the Maritime Co-chairman of the International Biological Program. He has served on numerous technical and organizational committees in the wildlife and forestry fields in both Canada and the United States.

For the UN Development Program he has worked on wildlife and land-use development projects in Rome, Zambia, and Kenya. Since 1973 he has been President of Eastern Ecological Research Limited, an environmental consulting firm, as well as being Professor of Biology at Acadia University.

Panel: Communicating about wildlife (2)

MODERATOR'S COMMENTS

D. Dodds
Acadia University

I was pleased to hear the Keynote Speaker address one of the items that might have been included in this panel, "Communicating with the media". If there is one thing we left out, that would have been the one that I might have chosen. However, Michael Halleran did address the problem to some extent and I am sure that the ideas that he brought forth are going to come up again.

Forestry

What we are dealing with in this panel are several areas of communication with people who are working in resource professions, as well as the users--the clientele. Firstly, forestry, which is a priority use on much of the Canadian land that we depend on for wildlife. Priority use can mean, in some areas, land-use developments or land-use programs with a loss of wildlife. In the case of forestry this does not happen--it may well mean the enhancement of wildlife populations of particular species and groups of species. Therefore, the need to communicate with people involved in the area of forestry is very important.

Our first speaker is going to address this aspect of communicating with the forester and forest manager. Bill Young, who is going to talk on this subject, is President of the Canadian Forestry Association of British Columbia, soon to be renamed the British Columbia Forestry Association. Until June 1984, Bill was the Chief Forester for the British Columbia Ministry of Forests. He was born, raised, educated, and has spent all of his working life in the Province of British Columbia.

Agriculture

After forestry, we will move on to agriculture, which is a priority in land management in many areas of Nova Scotia. Here agriculture involves relatively smaller areas of land than in some other provinces, but because it is a priority use in these areas and because it is total use, managed intensively, it leaves less room to manoeuvre for the wildlife manager.

To talk on this aspect of communication we have Keith Smith. He is a native Manitoban, a graduate in agriculture from the University of Manitoba, and holds an extension degree from the University of Wisconsin. He has been with the Manitoba Department of Agriculture for some 30 years as an agricultural representative and as an information officer. For the last 6 years he has been Principal of the Agricultural Extension Centre, which is an adult education training centre for rural men and women. He has also had some overseas experience and was with FAO-UN (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations) in Washington, DC, in 1978-79.

Users' groups

We have reached a time in our profession when we realize that there is a tremendous diversity of users out there, sometimes referred to as publics, who run the spectrum of groups mentioned by the Keynote Speaker, from the animal rights people through to the "macho" hunters. There are a great many groups. The users are all people we should address some attention to and they are all groups that we are going to have to communicate with a lot better than we are now.

Monte Hummel is going to address the problem of communicating with users. He has a tough task. However, those of you who know him, I am sure, realize that he is up to it. He was raised, he has said, in the bush in a hydro camp in northern Ontario. He has a master's degree in Philosophy, and a master's degree in Forestry--that is kind of nice--and he is President of the World Wildlife Fund Canada.

Politics

Nowadays, those people working in the public service are often attempting to communicate with their political representatives, particularly if that political representative happens to be the minister for whom they really work. A lot of people try to communicate with these people as well. To talk with us a little bit about communicating wildlife interests in relation to the elected representative we have Roger Simmons. He is a Member of the House of Assembly in Newfoundland. He is a former MLA, and has been a Parliamentary Secretary to a former Minister of Environment Canada.

Panel: Communicating about wildlife (3)

COMMUNICATING WITH THE FORESTER
The where, when, what, and how of communication between the forestry and wildlife constituencies

W. Young
President
Canadian Forestry Association of British Columbia

I appreciate the opportunity to participate in the 49th Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference. I especially appreciate the opportunity to discuss forestry-wildlife relationships, since I sincerely believe that there should be no more natural partners in integrated resource management programs than the forester and the wildlife biologist. We are concerned about conserving the same resource land-base. We have unlimited scope to integrate wildlife habitat and forest inventories. We have opportunities to efficiently integrate forest and wildlife research programs for the benefit of both resources. We have untold opportunities to "manipulate" habitat through logging and silviculture practices to the benefit of the wildlife resource, with little or no negative impact on the forest resource.

I am reminded of a friend of mine who often talks about wildlife biologists and foresters. He said that we may argue about who is up to bat, or who has got the ball, but we should have no argument on the maintenance of the ball park.

At the outset, I should hasten to emphasize what you and I know integrated resource management in Canada is far more complex than simply the integration of diverse forestry and wildlife interests. Of course, there are other resource concerns that will have to be accommodated--including the fisheries resource, the forest recreation resource, the aesthetic resource, and the livestock-range resource (at least in western Canada)--in addition to physical concerns such as soil stability, topography, climate, and the like. In fact, I submit that in much of Canada the diversity of the resources, topography, and climate is such that, in comparison, no other country, with the possible exception of our southern counsin just across the line, no other country has such complex integrated resources challenges. Thus my remarks concerning the wildlife-forestry interface are in full recognition that these two resources are only part of the resource spectrum.

With due recognition of this fact, I would now like to address the task given to me by your program chairman--"How the wildlife manager can best communicate his interests, concerns, and recommendations to the pertinent elements of the forestry community".

I have entitled my presentation "The where, when, what, and how of communication between forestry and wildlife constituencies". In addressing this question, I have chosen to develop the subject under these four headings:

(1) Where should wildlife concerns be addressed by the forestry community?

(2) When should wildlife concerns be addressed by the forestry community?

(3) What wildlife concerns should be addressed by the forestry community?

(4) How should wildlife concerns be communicated to the forestry community?

Where should wildlife concerns be addressed by the foresty community?

Every province has, or should have, a hierarchical resource planning system. At a minimum, the system should be comprised of the following three components.

Level 1 - "Provincial strategy"

It is here where provincial forestry and other resource goals and objectives should be identified and approved. Further, it is at the provincial strategic level of planning where government priorities and philosophies should be incorporated. While the management responsibility for most natural resources rests with the provinces, I appreciate that there are important exceptions, where national goals and objectives must be integrated into this provincial strategy. In our province, of course, the prime one is the salmon resource; the Fraser River being known as the most important salmon river in the world.

Level 2 - "Management unit strategy"

It is here where, under the umbrella of the "Provincial strategy", goals and objectives are established for specific management units.

Level 3 - "Operational strategy"

It is here, for example, where the specifics of the forest harvesting plan or logging plan are developed.

So much for the "where" for wildlife concerns. In discussing the "when, what, and how", I intend to show that wildlife issues must be incorporated into each of these three planning levels. In addition, I hope to emphasize the less-than-desirable results when such input is reserved until the Level 3 or final level of planning only.

When should wildlife concerns be addressed by the forestry community?

The "when" of the scheduling and timing of recommendations to the forestry community is critical. For example, it leads to nothing but frustration and bad feeling when wildlife concerns interface at Level 3, or the forest harvesting level of integration, only without any reference to the two higher hierarchical levels. I regret that this is what happens all too often.

This problem is particularly damaging if one accepts that Level 1, or "Provincial strategy" level of planning, reflects the priorities and philosophy of government. To enter the process at the "Operational strategy" level of planning puts the wildlife biologist in the position of simply being one of the many lobbyists attempting to further specific interests. But more critical is the fact that it could place agency wildlife biologists in the position of lobbying against their own government's priorities.

How much better it would be if the wildlife biologist was part of the planning process at all three levels rather than being referred to as a lobbyist, or even worse, a constraint.

I know that some are going to say, "But we're never invited to participate in the planning process". All I can say is that little progress would ever be made in integrated resource planning if we all waited for invitations. In other words, it's a two-way street. Invite yourself.

In summary, it is essential that wildlife concerns interface at all three levels, that is:

(1) an interface at the "Provincial strategy" level in order that provincial timber production goals and objectives can reflect provincial and national wildlife goals and objectives;

(2) an interface at the 'Management unit" level in order that the determination of rates of timber harvest for a region can reflect regional and local wildlife goals and objectives;

(3) an interface at the "Operational" or "Forest harvesting approval" level in order to monitor the results as they are reflected in the achievement of wildlife objectives. Further, where the monitoring process shows deficiencies, this should be reflected in revised provincial and management unit plans over time.

Of course, I need not mention that forest management and wildlife management are dynamic processes and the periodic interface has to be a continuous process. I would suggest that the review of "Provincial and management unit strategies" should be undertaken at a minimum of 5-year intervals, with new objectives and targets confirmed as the forestry/wildlife monitoring process indicates that adjustments to the objectives are required.

What wildlife concerns should be addressed by the forestry community?

"Provincial strategy" (Level 1)

It is at this level where provincial wildlife species plans should be developed along with an identification of the habitat requirements of each. This information is essential in the development of timber production targets that will directly influence the rate of harvest or allowable annual cut (AAC) for a management unit, along with the effect of the local forest harvesting plan itself. Further, wildlife species plans can directly affect, or be affected by, provincial forest harvesting, silviculture, and pest management strategies. Most important, it is at this provincial level of planning where government priorities, national and provincial, and philosophies should be reflected.

Again, and as I mentioned earlier, it is far too late in the game to relate this type of information and concern to the forestry constituency at Level 3, or the "Forest harvesting plan" level.

'Management unit" (Level 2)

It is at the 'Management unit" level where provincial timber production, silviculture, and pest management targets and objectives are apportioned to the

management units. In a parallel manner, the wildlife species targets and habitat requirements should be similarly apportioned. As in the "Provincial strategy" (Level 1) of integrated planning, this process at Level 2 should be in a written form. In fact, the forestry and wildlife interface and requirements should be documented in a formal "Management unit plan" in order to avoid misunderstanding.

Depending on the forest diversity, the wildlife diversity, or the ecosystem itself, specific constraints on the rate of timber harvest may be required. On the other hand, an acceptable relationship between forestry and wildlife programs may simply be a matter of scheduling and, thus, should have little or no negative impact on the rate of timber harvest, or the AAC of the management unit. An example of the former in British Columbia is the management of mountain caribou, where the species' habitat requirement could involve a significant impact on the AAC of timber. On the other hand, management of the elk herds and their habitat requirements in the east Kootenays has little negative impact on timber production. (I wish that I could say the same about elk and the ranching industry.)

In addition to examples of specific constraints and scheduling, there are examples where forest harvesting and silviculture investments are beneficial to both the forest and wildlife resource. An example involving silviculture investments would be the spacing of dry-belt Douglas fir and yellow pine thickets in southern British Columbia. Such a silviculture program is beneficial to timber production and the wildlife resource--not to mention the benefits to range cattle and the rancher.

It is these types of constraints, potentials, and opportunities that should be identified in the management plan of the management unit--all of course under the umbrella of approved provincial goals and objectives.

"Forest harvesting plans" (Level 3)

Earlier I mentioned that the interface of the wildlife manager at this level should be largely a monitoring role. If the provincial integration is in place and the "Management unit level plans" have identified the relationship between timber and wildlife objectives, along with the habitat requirements, why shouldn't the forest harvesting planning phase, along with the follow-up silviculture programs, be relatively easy to implement in an integrated process?

Notwithstanding this upbeat stance, I am not so naive as to believe that forest harvesting plans and silviculture plans proceed with no problems relating to the wildlife resource. But where problems do occur, I would suggest that it is largely because there was little or no wildlife input at the "Provincial" and "Management unit" levels of planning. When such wildlife/habitat input is communicated only in the context of Level 3 ("Forest harvesting plans") it is little wonder that the results are less than satisfactory.

How should wildlife concerns be communicated to the forestry community?

In addressing the "how" of communicating wildlife habitat needs to the forestry community, I am not referring to whether the means should be oral or written. Rather I am talking about attitudes, which are equally important, and to be frank I would really say more important than technical information in developing the communication necessary to achieve an integrated forestry/wildlife resource plan.

Since it takes "two to tango", my reference to personal attitudes in resource management applies equally to the wildlife and forestry community manager and user as well as to every other resource community.

Last fall I developed a resource management attitude barometer which I call the "Youngometer" (and yes, it has a British Columbia patent). Time does not permit me to review my "Attitude Youngometer" this afternoon. Basically, however, it is a method--or tool if you will--by which resource managers and resource users can be evaluated and categorized with respect to resource attitudes. Numerical values are given to attitudes and personality attributes such as: is the person basically a spear-chucker or a bridge-builder; with a sense of humour or humourless? (Have you ever heard a person with a good forestry, wildlife or integrated attitude who was humourless? I have never heard of one.) Then, is this a positive person or basically a negative person, a shaker and mover, or simply just a bitcher and bawler (as I call them)? There are other questions, but when these numerical values are totalled, they give a success rating potential for achieving a satisfactory consensus on resource management issues.

For example, representatives from the wildlife and forestry constituency with a high "Youngometer" rating should readily agree to an acceptable consensus position on forestry/wildlife integration issues. On the other hand, should one or both have a low rating--forget it. Some other process would then have to be found because these two people (e.g. forester and wildlife biologist) have attitude ratings that can never lead to a consensus. Rather there will be a winner and a loser, which is not what resource integration is all about.

Summary

I have attempted to touch on the type of wildlife information that is required in order to integrate wildlife management and forest management programs. Equally important as the information itself is the identification of the level of planning where forestry and wildlife plans should be integrated. I have to repeat it again. Finally, the attitude of the various actors in the process (managers and users) towards the integrated resource management process is as important an element as any.

To end on an upbeat tone, one has only to take a look backwards in time to appreciate the positive strides that we have all taken in communication between forester and wildlife biologist and the development of an integrated resource philosophy. Let us take my own personal case: when I was in university (which was not really 100 years ago), I received no instruction whatsoever on any aspect of multiple use, integrated use, co-use, or whatever the popular phrase is today. In fact, these phrases were not mentioned once in all my time in university--20 years ago, I did not even know a wildlife biologist, far less know the habitat requirements for elk, caribou, mule deer, or moose--well maybe moose, because I lived in north-central BC at the time. Today, however, at least in my province and I am sure elsewhere, even the far-out, cigar-smoking, timber baron has an appreciation of the relationship between forestry and wildlife programs. The same can be said for the equally far-out preservationist who decries almost any tree being cut for use in Canada.

So, we have come a long way in the wildlife/forestry level of understanding, integration, and communication. But time is not on our side, as the "supposed"

days of resource super-abundance are gone and increasing pressures on the forest resource, the wildlife resource, and the base that supports both are inescapable facts of life.

I am certain that the people in each province of our country want their forest resource to continue to produce multiple benefits to society, including the maintenance of a viable forest industry and a diverse wildlife resource. While the days of super-abundance are over and there is no free lunch, the challenge obviously rests with forestry and wildlife managers and users to ensure that the forest resource in the broadest sense is appropriately managed and renewed for the benefit of timber production and wildlife production. I contend that the fastest and most effective way of achieving this end is to broaden the lines of inter-communication--at all levels.

Panel: Communicating about wildlife (4)

COMMUNICATING WITH THE FARMER

R.K. Smith
Principal, Agricultural Extension Centre
Brandon, Man.

Thank you for asking me to be part of this conference, and particularly for allowing me to join the other panelists in exploring this specific area of dealing with other resource interests and decision-makers in "Communicating about wildlife".

Those who start their remarks with provisos and apologies are immediately suspect, but you should know that (a) I am not a wildlife manager and (b) I am not a farmer, but (c) I do talk to farmers on a regular basis in my line of work. I also should point out that, as the only panel member west of the Ottawa Valley and east of the Rocky Mountains, I will be using Prairie, and even more specificallyManitoba, examples.

Farm land and its use

Communicating about wildlife varies a good deal across Canada. It is mainly in the West, I expect, where the private farm landowner still remains such a dominant entity. In much of Canada farming has become a part-time occupation, and those who make only a part of their living from agriculture may have a somewhat different attachment to the land and to policies that affect its use.

There is no doubt that our basic soils resource in this country is being threatened. We are the second largest country in the world, yet less than 5% of Canada, because of climate and soil type, is actually cropped, and this 5% is spread from coast to coast (Standing Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries, and Forestry 1984). Most of this vast country's class I land--the best for agricultural production--can be seen from Toronto's CN Tower on a clear day. We live in a society that fully endorses a cheap-food policy and, as Canadians, are smack up against and in competition with the giant US food-making machine, where preservation of the small family farm is given even less attention than here in Canada.

Today the more efficient farmer survives. Efficiency means larger farms, bigger machinery, monoculture agriculture, and increased use of herbicides and pesticides. Today's modern, efficient business-like farmers are not against conservation or the preservation of wildlife--they are for their own survival. No one has been able to prove to them that the long-term approach to "good" farming, with its emphasis on zero tillage, field shelterbelts, legumes in the rotation, etc. will pay their short-term interest payments, fuel bills, and the tax on their land.

We continue to take our best agricultural land out of production. Every hour the United States loses 90 ha of its food-growing farm lands to town-houses, shopping centres, and coal mines (Sampson 1981). Before we start to get smug, here in

Canada, between 1961 and 1976, we lost over 1.4 million ha of crop land to highways, shopping malls, and subdivisions--that is a Prince Edward Island-sized slice--and it is still continuing. Anyone who thinks this kind of alternate use does not put pressure on less-productive farm land is having a pipe-dream.

The subsequent pressure on the remaining land for wildlife habitat is also bound to increase. Farmers have to take some blame too. In Manitoba farmers have to share in the problem. There are 130 km^2 of wetland area and 260 km^2 of woodland lost each year in Manitoba, and I imagine much of that is lost to agriculture. Wildlife managers tell me that despite the myth of the "great wildlife machine in the north", the greatest variety and numbers of wildlife are indigenous to "Agro-Manitoba".

We are here to talk about communication, and a number of people have referred to what can be done. I think we should start talking to one another a little more. I thought it would be interesting for you to hear from some Manitobans that I talked to recently--a couple of wildlife managers, some farmers, and some media people--about how better to communicate with the farmer.

Comments taken from videotape recordings

Commentator:

> It is well known that the wildlife manager and the farm manager don't always understanding each other's point of view. How can they communicate better? That is the question we asked farmer Bob Sopuck. Bob was once a wildlife biologist with the federal government. Now he farms just south of Riding Mountain National Park in Manitoba and he feels that some professional wildlife managers are out of touch and don't understanding.

Bob Sopuck - farmer:

> Well, the problem is that these wildlife professionals, because they don't really appreciate the cost-price squeeze that farmers are under, have been unable to communicate wildlife values to the agricultural community. To me it is obvious that, if we are to preserve wildlife habitat on private land, the burden of the resource must be shifted from those who pay for the production of wildlife to those who say that they own it, mainly the public. Various schemes have been developed to date to test this, such as tax relief, outright leasing of prime wildlife habitat, and so on. The point is that farmers will respond to incentives if society really wants to preserve wildlife habitat on private land.
>
> So, if wildlife professionals hope to effect any kind of change and provide a reconcilation between wildlife and agriculture, they had better become more aware of the economy that affects agriculture and the land-management decisions that affect wildlife.

Commentator:

> What are some of those land-management decisions that farmers have to make? With Bob Hicks of Souris, Manitoba, it is protecting his strawberries. Bob's

"pick-your-own" operation is only part of his farm business, but he doesn't appreciate the white-tailed deer damage he has sustained over the past few years.

Bob Hicks - farmer:

The problem that we have with jumping deer, as far as we and the strawberries are concerned, really has to do with the damage they do in the winter. They are inclined to come into the patch and paw the straw off the ground, knock the cover off the strawberries. If it doesn't snow and the wind stays up, then the crowns freeze and the strawberries die. The deer are very difficult to move off the patch, short of shooting them dead.

As it happened this year, the wildlife people instituted a program of feeding them at various stations located throughout the country. This happened in conjunction with some of our scare tactics, and they sort of moved off the patch. The program of feeding them was certainly beneficial to us. I have never felt that the program was developed just entirely so it could be beneficial to us. I have always felt that it was a program designed to maintain the deer population, and the fact that it was beneficial to us was largely incidental. I think any program that is designed to benefit a certain group of people, be they hunters or environmentalists, should be borne by the people who benefit.

Commentator:

Would paid hunting help? Jim Irwin worked at one time as a wildlife biologist in Ontario. Now he is a Manitoba rancher and he sees things differently. He thinks the farmer would do a better job of protecting habitat if he got some up-front direct returns.

Jim Irwin - rancher:

You know, I have been a hunter and a fisherman and I have always been interested in that aspect. It seems to be that when I look at these biologists from this perspective now, I look at them protecting their own interests as opposed to trying to look at the thing from an overview and see what is best for everybody around. Eventually it is going to go to paid hunting, and hopefully it won't go to the same extent that it has in Europe, where only the filthy rich can afford to hunt and the very rich have to go elsewhere. I think that the whole realm of wildlife management could be enhanced if the idea of paid hunting was developed. We would see farmers starting to integrate wildlife management with their farming practices, which have a lot of soil conservation ramifications, letting the bush grow back and not draining the sloughs, but seeing them as a resource on their farm.

Commentator:

Obviously the wildlife manager and the farmer aren't communicating very well. Ron Arnst has lived in Saskatchewan and Manitoba all his life and has been communicating with farm families on farm radio stations for years.

Ron Arnst - radio announcer:

I think communication with the farmers is a matter of elevation. There is nothing that is going to turn farmers off faster than someone who talks down to them, and particularly when we are talking about land use. Most of the farmers today have grown up on and with the property that they are now farming. They feel that there is no one--and I think with some justification--that there is no one who knows better how to use that land than they. So you can't automatically walk in with a three-piece-suit sort of attitude and say, "Do this, do that, this is good, this is right, this is wrong", because you will end up on the outside of the barb-wire looking in.

I think the important thing is to remember who you are talking to. You are talking to people who don't just have a financial interest in this land; they have a life interest. It is a very personal relationship. That may seem a little strange to say that a guy has a personal relationship with a summerfallow field but it is true. Most farmers I know feel that way about their land. It is not just a farm, it is not just a living, it is not just a business-it is a way of life, and when you are talking to them about the way they live and the practices that they have in that life, it is a heck of a lot different than talking to someone about the way they drive a truck or sell shoes. So you have to take a personal approach when you are talking to farmers and talk to them--I hate to say on their level, because it means like you have to get down on their level, you know--but you can't talk at them, you have to talk with them and to them. It is a real exercise in communication--no question.

Commentator:

Ron Arnst's radio program is one way to communicate with farmers, Miles Phillips of the "Boissevain Recorder" thinks his paper is another good method.

Miles Phillips - weekly newspaper editor:

Well, of course, naturally I believe that the best way to communicate with the public is through the community newspaper. It is certainly a very good method--it does reach all the homes in a particular community. I would suggest working through the local community newspapers. Undoubtedly that is the best method--a weekly column possibly along the lines that the conservation district has, or the ag. rep. (agricultural representative) has, or the home economist has--something of that nature might be the best method of reaching the public.

We would like it to be short, and I think that that only makes sense because if it is long people don't read it. People are bombarded with words these days and if it is long they are not going to start into it, so I think for their own benefit it should be short. It has to be regular, because the most aggravating thing about a paper is that if a column doesn't come in one week, it comes out in a long, long one the next week, and so forth. So I would make it short and I would make it on a regular basis, and try and localize it too. If you can bring in local names of people in the community who have done something for wildlife conservation, that makes it of more interest to the readers.

Commentator:

Next we have Wayne Cowan presenting the views of a biologist.

Wayne Cowan - biologist:

What I have always tried to do when working with farmers and trying to get something out of them, let's say, is that I look for a way that we can co-operate--something that my company or I can do with the farmer that has advantages to waterfowl and to wildlife in general and habitat, but also has some basic advantages to the farmer. Many of the techniques that we use lately have a very strong financial or economic benefit to the farmer, such as the growing of winter wheat, which we help farmers to test on their land. We provide the drill, for instance--a major cost on small acreages that farmers don't want to put out themselves in order to learn a technique. If it works for them, and very often it does, they then will go out and buy a drill and get into winter wheat. This has many economic benefits for them, as we all know, but at the same time it has large benefits for waterfowl and wildlife in general; for habitat, nesting sites, feeding sites, and cover.

Commentator:

Lawrence Kelly of Ducks Unlimited has successfully negotiated land settlements with farmers for 33 years, and almost all of DU's projects in Lawrence's territory are on private farmland, so he must be doing something right.

Lawrence Kelly - wildlife technician:

Never do I go to a farmer and within 5 minutes say, "Well, I want you to sign this, or I want you to sign this, that and the other thing". I try to get to know that farmer, so that he or she gets to know me and builds trust in me. I know that from people coming to our home trying to sell things. They come in--"I am a salesman selling so and so"--and right away I don't want it and yet I don't known anything about it. So there have to be benefits there for the farmer in some respect. The majority of them, not all. There are a lot of farmers out there who still like wildlife and still care for it very much, and they look after it with great respect.

There have got to be more benefits yet to come for farmers, and I mean in dollars and cents, because they are in a pinch and there is no getting out of it. The biggest majority of the farmers are in a pinch; even the well established farmers are just holding their own. If there was only the taxes paid on some of this bush for deer and so forth, and also for waterfowl and other wildlife--just the taxes paid--I am sure a lot of it would be left. But I think Canadians, as a whole, Canadian citizens--whether they work in the city or in the country, or whoever they are--owe something to wildlife, and they should be helping to keep it, not just the farmer alone keeping it.

Well, that is what those fellows had to say about it. I could not help but agree with most of what they had to say. So I think it is fairly obvious that the situation is serious.

Some considerations

I would suggest that as wildlife managers you consider the following:

(1) Remember that aesthetics are beautiful, but facts hit home. (A bit like "Candy is dandy, but liquor is quicker".) Increased drainage and land-clearing mean less top-soil moisuture for crop production and lower water levels in farm wells. It's happening. The farmers know it. Why don't you help remind them.

(2) Encourage conservation techniques like "zero tillage". There is increasing proof that this farming method can be adopted by most farmers. There is less (and smaller-sized) machinery to buy and fewer passes to be made over the field with equipment. Nesting habitat is improved and soil erosion is controlled.

(3) Work hard for improved air and water quality. Conserving the soil has advantages for wildlife, but it also enhances the quality of the water and air for everyone--including the farmer.

(4) Emphasize the value of wildlife. Do the farmers know the importance of maintaining a proper balance between agriculture and wildlife habitat? If not, explain it to them.

(5) Question some of Canadian agriculture's sacred-cow policies. For example, the grain quota system rewards farmers who farm "corner-to-corner". Ask the politicians and bureaucrats to re-examine these policies.

(6) Encourage research that will enhance wildlife production. Much of agribusiness research is exploitive of our land base--going for the highest yields, maximum use of anhydrous ammonia, herbicides for complete weed control, etc. Faculties of agriculture cannot rely totally on government funding, and look to commercial companies for this kind of research support. Lobby and encourage urban voters (farm voters, too, but remember they are outnumbered 20 to 1 by the urban vote today) to support research in cereals that fix their own nitrogen, and in development and testing of equipment to better place seed and fertilizer in a no-till system.

(7) Pressure politicians to co-operate with organizations like the Manitoba-North Dakota Zero Tillage Farmers' Association, which is attempting to reduce patent restrictions on glyphosphate--a practice that keeps the price of this product high and prohibits its use by the farmer. (Glyphosphate is a "burn off" herbicide essential to conservation tillage).

(8) Finally, help the farmers to set aside land for wildlife. They are generally not against this; they just hate getting little remuneration and/or recognition for doing it.

How do you communicate with the farmer?

There are many ways to communicate. You heard some of them earlier; here are a few other ideas:

(1) Talk directly to the farming public. Find out about their business, visit them on their farms, then show that you have learned something. Wayne Cowan, I think, was an example of someone whose first degree, or first interest, was biology not agriculture, but he had made a point of learning about farming and crop-production practices.

(2) Talk to those who represent the farmers. The local municipal councillor may be able to help you by explaining to the ratepayers in his or her ward the project you have in mind.

(3) Be sure farmers are represented on your wildlife organization. It is easy to nominate the farmers who hunt. Pass them by perhaps and contact two or three who make farming a "business", and somehow get them on your board and hear what they have to say.

(4) Encourage local programs that protect farmers' rights--e.g. written permission to hunt, etc.

(5) Make sure the farmers know that wildlife managers are not anti-farming but pro-conservation, and that you appreciate their efforts to preserve wildlife habitat.

(6) If you are writing or broadcasting about a new on-farm conservation technique, be sure to interview the farmers who are involved and see that they get a share of the story.

(7) Use the local media, but use them skillfully. Let me give you a personal example. I live 11 miles northwest of Brandon on a farm site that was surveyed out of a large grain farm many years ago. There was this beautiful single-row shelterbelt of elm, ash, and caragana, and it protected the road that I go to work on every day from snow build-up. I came home one day in the fall to bind a bulldozer levelling the shelterbelt. You can imagine how I would feel about it--I really was upset. The fellow who was running the bulldozer was just hired by the farmer. When I nearly hauled him out of the cab, he said, "Hey, lay off, I am just doing my job". So I ran and got the camera and took some pictures.

I then contacted the 'Manitoba Co-operator", a weekly farm paper that reaches practically every farm home in Manitoba. I asked them if they would run a picture. They said that they would, and the cut-line read: "This established single-row shelterbelt in the Brandon area recently was destroyed to allow easier movement of big tillage machinery and to gain a couple of acres of crop land. However, a nearby road probably will drift full this winter and the field has lost its protection". Right under that picture was another one that I had taken earlier, which showed some of the things that you could do about it. It was a photo of a conservation agrologist, Glen Shaw, who is now with PFRA in Saskatoon. Glen was shown with a spacing experiment on field shelterbelts where, in fact, they were pulling some of the caragana out and allowing the wind to blow through those trees, allowing for even snow-spread in the field. Probably, if we had been able to get the farmer to find out a bit more about that, he might have left that belt in place. At any rate, it did not point a finger directly at that farmer, but it did point out something that he might be able to do. That is one way, I think, of using the media effectively.

I would just like to say a few more things. As wildlife managers you should encourage overall farm policies that reward farmers for less exploitation of their land, for maintaining their farms in a fertile condition, for setting land aside--policies that can guarantee them a level of living equal to those who farm every acre intensively. Wildlife managers can work with soil conservationists and other agrologists, policy-makers, and farmers to "phase in" these kinds of plans.

Be aware of the fact that most farmers know how to farm in a more "conserving" way than they do, but are being forced, through the proverbial cost-price squeeze, to eke higher and higher yields in the short run in order to stay on the land.

References

Standing Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries, and Forestry. 1984. Soil at risk - Canada's eroding future. A report on soil conservation to the Senate of Canada.

Sampson, R. Neil. 1981. Farm land or wasteland. Rodale Press.

Panel: Communicating about wildlife (5)

COMMUNICATING WITH THE USER:
Wildlife, intolerance, and speedometers

M. Hummel
President
World Wildlife Fund Canada

I spend about half of my time raising money. If you are really curious, my particular responsibility at the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) on the fund-raising side works out to about $10 000 per day. There is a saying that is well known among fund-raisers: "If you want money, ask for advice." I might add that after about 16 years of raising money I have got my own corollary--that if you ever want advice, just try asking for money.

In any case, to me this little slogan demonstrates a basic principle about communication which I would like to explore in my talk. After all, if you ask someone for advice, you are indicating that you respect that person, you want to know what he or she has to say about something, and you are prepared to listen. You are also signalling that you do not think you know it all. In fact, you genuinely need someone else's help. I suggest all of that is fertile ground for communication.

I am also suggesting that whether or not people communicate depends a lot on what they think of each other. At its worst, communication is simply a matter of reinforcing prejudices. At its best, it is an exercise in mutual respect. As someone said, 'Minds are like parachutes; they only function when open."

Sitting down together

Let me give you a specific example concerning wildlife. Some of you may recall my suggestion, last year at this conference, that traditional conservationists sit down with the animal protectionists or animal rights activists, who have been referred to abundantly here, to seriously discuss their differences. Up to now, it has been more a matter of lobbing grenades back and forth from a distance, and stereotyping each other as having absolutely nothing to say for themselves. Well, a coalition of native organizations, Indigenous Survival International (ISI), decided it was worth a try. As a result, this January, I attended a small private meeting between ISI and the leadership of Greenpeace.

Now, if every there was a set-up for a lack of communication, this was it. Both parties had good reason to be intensely suspicious of each other. On the one hand, ISI had the option of regarding all Greenpeacers as insensitive, urban-based do-gooders who were prepared to wipe out native life-styles without caring about the consequences. Does it sound familiar? On the other hand, Greenpeacers could have gone into such a meeting with pre-conceived notions about the cruelty of leg-hold traps, assumptions about native over-harvesting, and a sense that the fur industry was destined for oblivion anyway--so what differences did it make?

I am not saying that none of these views came to the table, but I can tell you that both sides went into that meeting with a genuine intention to listen rather than propagandize. Before assuming that they were sworn enemies, as the press and other intermediaries were telling them, Greenpeace and ISI decided first to have a straight-forward information session, to understand each other's position "from the horse's mouth", and then make their own judgements about whether war was inevitable. As a result, it was a most useful and productive exchange. In my view, it was an excellent exercise in communication because both sides wanted it to be.

Yes, certain differences emerged and were clearly identified, but you would all be surprised at the much longer list of shared concerns and areas for mutual support. Since these discussions are continuing, I would rather let the two parties speak for themselves than have me comment any further on how things are going. But I give it to you as an example of an honest effort to communicate on wildlife issues. If ISI and Greenpeace can do it, then surely the agencies represented in this room can.

"X" and "Y" theories

I like to compare this aspect of communication with the well-known "theory X" and "theory Y" of management. "Theory X", you will recall, is the old, bureaucratic "top-down" model. Well my "theory X" of communication is assume that you are communicating with the enemy, or idiots. As a result, do not trust them, have hidden agendas, withhold information, make deals behind people's backs, mystify them with techno-babble, or talk down to them. Sometimes the "theory X" approach involves what is euphemistically referred to as "educating the public", or public education, which really means showing them the wisdom of your views. Of course, none of this suggests that the public, or the other party, may actually have some useful, independent contribution to make, and by now we all know that people are rather sensitive to this.

In case you think this is a disguised crack at government and other senior people in the business community, let me say that, in my view, non-governmental organizations are often the most guilty of this kind of intolerance, especially among each other, and of course when assuming a "holier-than-thou" posture by boycotting meetings, or treating senior decision-makers as nothing but "blue meanies". So much for "theory X".

"Theory Y" of management relates to organizations where there is shared decision-making, team-work (shades of last year's conference), and a less "top-down" approach to corporate structure. My "theory Y" of communication, therefore, advocates openness, mutual respect, getting all the information out on the table (after all, if your information is good, what do you have to fear from getting it out on the table?), inviting potential critics to improve on it, and trying to solve wildlife issues on the assumption that you have a mutual problem and a shared concern.

An example of this perspective, I hope, is the recent announcement of the Wildlife Toxicology Fund, a joint venture between Environment Canada, World Wildlife Fund, and Noranda Inc. Environment Canada is providing $1 million per year for at least 3 years, to be matched by grants from the private sector and other levels

of government. WWF is administering the fund by appointing a Research Advisory Board, which evaluates research proposals and determines levels of funding. Obviously, we also hope to help in finding matching funds. Noranda provided a corporate grant of $50 000 to WWF, not to the Government of Canada as suggested in Mr. Caccia's press release, to cover the administrative costs of the fund, so that we in WWF can provide this service at no expense to government or to the people of Canada.

When I was interviewed by CBC's "As it happens", Elizabeth Grey asked, "What kind of unholy alliance is this--WWF, Environment Canada, and Noranda?" My response was that it was not an unholy alliance; it was a new alliance among three parties (governmental, non-governmental, and corporate) who had decided to work together on a concern shared by all Canadians, namely the effects of toxic chemicals on wildlife. There had been a lot of hand-wringing about this problem and we felt that maybe we should try to do something about it.

This example makes the same point, I think, as the Greenpeace and ISI example. Assume the worst about each other, and you can kiss effective communication good-bye. Assume the best, or at least give them the benefit of the doubt, and you will have the basis for communication, as well as a productive working relationship that leads to solving problems.

Consider the alternative. For example, once you polarize an issue with distrust and name-calling, the tendency is for both sides to dig in and never to change their mind for fear of losing face, regardless of the evidence. I am sure the seal hunt was an issue of this kind for both sides, and I suspect that the wolf hunt in British Columbia is as well. Consider also the likelihood of ever working with an individual or agency in the future, after you have tried to humiliate them publicly.

"Speedometer theory"

Closely related to how we regard each other, is how we regard the subject or issue being discussed. I could not believe the "Youngometer", because now you are going to get Hummel's "Speedometer theory of problem perception". Simply put, on the low or left side of the speedometer, imagine wildlife concerns for which there is a relatively easy solution that satisfies most parties. For example, in order to protect waterfowl populations in southern Ontario, we no longer have a spring hunting season. This is generally agreed upon by everyone as being good for the ducks and the ducks' hunters.

Now, on the high or right side of the speedometer, imagine those issues for which there appear to be no easy solutions--a win/lose, "Mexican stand-off" situation. For example, duck hunting either will or will not be continued in Point Pelee National Park. There is no middle ground. It is yes or no. Do you "oink" or do you "moo", as they used to say in the 60s.

Finally, in the large area in between on the speedometer, imagine a range of issues, not black or white, but in that boring, challenging grey middle-ground where a little creative problem-solving based on effective communication will likely resolve things. I do not know if it is a good example or not, but I thought an example might be if ducks were causing crop depredation problems, one should establish lure crops near ideal habitat to ease the pressure on farm fields. Incidentally, if you do not like my examples, that is okay; just plug in some that make sense to you.

The point of all this? Well, if you see all wildlife issues as "Mexican stand-offs", your way of communicating about them will reflect this. You are looking for a fight, or expecting one. The same is true if you think a problem is really easily solved, or in the middle category, and the other guy does not, and may be looking for a fight, which is the last thing you had in mind. I have observed many discussions where effective communication has been blocked because of completely different perspectives on this kind of a mismatch. Sometimes the challenge is to convince both parties that a certain problem is solvable, that it can be moved into the middle range of the speedometer. I am by no means suggesting that all wildlife problems fit into one category or the other. In truth, I think they are scattered all over the speedometer. But where you place a specific issue, and where I place it, can greatly affect our ability to communicate about it. So much for Hummel's "Speedometer".

Language problems

I believe these two thoughts--that communication depends on how we regard each other and how we regard the subject being discussed--are fundamental. However, there are obviously a large number of less basic but still very important technical aspects to communication. For example, did you know that something like 90% of your message is communicated by body-language, or kinesics, and para-language aspects such as tone and volume? And, even though they may account for less than 10% of the message, look at the words used by today's "renewable resource managers" to describe wildlife. For example, I have heard all members of the weasel family simply called "fur". A moose herd is referred to as "the resource". The fact that wolves under pressure may have more pups translates into "compensatory natality as a factor of density dependent variables". No wonder people with common sense and above-average intelligence look a little puzzled.

During the 7 years that I taught at the University of Toronto, I spent the first 3 years teaching students scholarly research techniques, then the 4th or graduate years helping them unlearn the first 3 years in order to be effective communicators. That process includes learning how to summarize and highlight information; laying out briefing materials for busy people; saying it with pictures, tables, or graphs; getting rid of the baffle-gab; using slides, overheads, or videotapes; and effectively using the telephone. In other words, once you know how you regard the issue and how you regard your audience, these technical aspects of communication are terribly important. We all need to be regularly coached and updated on them. Abe Lincoln's apology to someone for writing a long letter, because he did not take the time to write a short one, is as relevant today as it was then.

In closing, let me return to my theme. When it comes to communicating about wildlife, or about anything, people who are intolerant, superior, or extreme are held in suspicion. People who are reasonable, participative, and fair are convincing. I suspect that the animal rights movement has got a problem here. Dean Rusk, a seasoned US negotiator, said that one of the best ways to persuade others was with your ears--by listening to them. Following Rusk's advice can help us all learn to make a point without making an enemy.

Finally, I suggest that we all try this test. If in the last few years you have not discarded a major opinion or acquired a new one, you are likely to be a poor communicator. Also check your pulse--you may be dead.

Panel: Communicating about wildlife (6)

COMMUNICATING WITH THE POLITICIAN

R. Simmons
Member of the House of Assembly
Newfoundland and Labrador

I have fond memories of at least a couple of others of these conferences. The last one I was at was in Charlottetown in 1981, I believe. I just want in opening also to acknowledge the presence of the Canadian Wildlife Service staff because I had a marvellous time with them. They have to be among the best people in the federal service. I say that now without any thought of my back being scratched back, because I am not in the federal arena these days, as you all know.

I have been asked to describe here, as specifically as possible, how the wildlife manager and those interested in wildlife can communicate their interests, concerns, recommendations, etc. to the various elements and sectors of the political community--which could be said in one word: lobbying. What then is lobbying? What is this thing that you are about to do? Did your mother in her worst nightmares dream that you would grow up to be a lobbyist? Is it something you go blind with if you do it too long?

What is lobbying? Someone has said it is creative loitering. Another has said that a successful lobbyist is like the perfect crime--if you do it properly nobody will ever know it took place. Someone else says it is sort of like adultery--it is not the sort of thing the successful ones will talk about. All of which illustrates two essential ingredients of lobbying: firstly, premeditation, or to put it in less sinister terms, preparedness; and secondly, its behind-the-scenes nature, usually, but there are exceptions.

Packaging

Now, if lobbying is communicating your concerns to the politicians, you had better have a clear idea of what you want to say and how you want to say it. Many good lobbying opportunities have been blown early because some zealot had the mistaken impression that all he had to do was get in the same room with a politician and everything else would come naturally.

The message may get through all right, but because the package is all wrong, the method is all wrong, the impact of the message gets lost in a confusion of other signals. How then do you package what you want to say? In putting the question, I assume that you know what you want to say, but so many people know what they want to say and do not know quite how to say it; how to package it to have the desired results.

My first answer to that question is that you do it simply and you do it briefly. You have no idea how much paper an MP, an MHA, an MLA, or a Minister gets on an average day. I would say that during the 5½ years I was in Ottawa, on any day, what we called the reading mail as opposed to the first-class stuff and so on

(the reading mail is a euphemism for junk mail often) ran anywhere from 6 inches to 5 or 6 feet thick. I have seen days when you got 6 feet of mail, 8½ by 11, if you piled it all up. So the thought that somebody is going to wade through your kit--it just does not happen.

I have seen on the other side, in volunteer organizations, people who are putting together briefs. I wish somebody would only explain to those people the origin of the word "brief". They have got this mistaken notion that somehow the longer it is and the more pieces of paper that they can staple together the more impressive it is going to be. The best brief is a brief brief, usually a one-page one, keeping in mind that the person you are communicating to is not callous but busy, and makes selections and often selects the longer items for later reading. I used to have a pile on the floor and, unlike the garbage can, I would only dump it every 6 months. I would go through it and find that it was time to get rid of it--I meant to read it but, of course, I never got around to doing so. So the quick answer to the question is make it simple and make it brief.

It is even more important, though, to package your concern in terms of the politician's interest. Now that is elementary, but it is not done. Apply what I just said to your own family situation, just for an example. Don't you package your message in terms of the boy's interest, the daughter's interest, in that particular family? Don't you almost, whenever you want to get any message through, package it in terms of what is in it for the other guy; what is in it for the person you are sending the message to? When it comes to politicians, we often seem to take a different approach, but we will come to that in a moment too.

Keep in mind that the politician inevitably asks himself/herself: Why should I get involved in this? What is in this for me?. You have to come at it, you see, from his angle, from her angle. Now, if you know what you want to say, why you want to say it, and how you are going to say it, the next question is: Who are you going to say it to? In lobbying, as in life itself (Mr. Hummel made some allusion to this point) communication problems most often arise not because you do not know what you are talking about, or you do not say it clearly enough, but because you do not know who it is you should be talking to.

A former United States Senator, reflecting on his having come out of a meeting in which Henry Kissinger just got hammered for failing to consult with Congress on some foreign policy initiative, tells that Kissinger said: "Look, I am willing to consult, but who do I consult with; how do you consult with the whole Congress?". With whom do you communicate your concerns as wildlifers? Who do you talk to? To answer that question it is best to keep in mind two essential facts of life about Canadian government: its federal structure and its parliamentary nature, which means first that the system's effective power is widely dispersed among levels of government. Secondly, it means that real decision-making is found in the executive part of government, in the Cabinet and the senior bureaucracy. You must, therefore, especially with respect to a split-jurisdiction issue like wildlife, talk to both orders of government, federal and provincial.

In passing, just let me note that there is a strategy used with increasing frequency these days; the strategy of making it advantageous for one order of government to make your case to the other order of government. In less kind terms it is playing off one government against the other, but it has been known to be done. I guess a Canadian adaptation of the age-old process of lobbying.

Federal level

Let me take a moment then to talk about lobbying at the federal level; the level that perhaps I know best. I have spent 6 years in provincial politics in Newfoundland, all in opposition, and 5½ in Ottawa, both in opposition and on the government side. But I think that perhaps I know the federal perspective best, because I have seen some of it from the government side.

First of all let me deal with a myth that politicians are somehow aloof and uncaring and unreceptive--the only way to deal with them is by getting them across a barrel. Indeed, one of the speakers here illustrated the point beautifully. He said you talked to the voters, you encouraged consumers, you helped farmers, and you pressured politicians. Much of the lack of success in getting your concerns through to politicians results from that basic inherent and mistaken impression--that politicians must be browbeaten into doing anything.

Now let me go back and reword what I have just said about talking to voters, encouraging consumers, helping farmers, and pressuring politicians. Have you ever thought--and link this up with what I said earlier about packaging your concerns in terms of the other person's interest--wouldn't it be a novel idea if some speaker stood here and instead of saying talk to voters, encourage consumers and help farmers, he said why don't you talk to politicians, encourage politicians, and help politicians? This is the essential message I want to leave with you today--until you package that concern in terms of the politician's interest, you have not got a hope of getting to first base, or to say the corollary of that--if you keep coming at the politician as though "Look here, buddy, you are a guy I have got to beat in order to have my way", well the odds are that he might beat you.

If you see the politician as one to be pressured, one to be snookered, then I submit that you are on the wrong wavelength. But you are not alone on that wavelength; many have been on that wavelength before and many are still there.

As I have noted earlier, decision-making authority is vested in Cabinet and in the senior bureaucracy. So when you talk about the "political community" you have got to include the senior bureaucrats, especially at the federal level. They are very much a part of our political landscape, not in a partisan sense necessarily, but in terms of influencing the direction of public policy. It seems to me that the best way to get the ear of the Cabinet Minister and the senior bureaucrat is to be available and to be informed. Both aspects of that comment might come as a surprise to you--we should assume that you were available and you were informed--perhaps you feel both deeply.

Let me give it to you from the perspective of a former federal politician. During my 2 years as a Parliamentary Secretary to Mr. Roberts, who was then the Minister of Environment, I discovered all too often that would-be lobbyists were neither. They were not available when you needed them and they were not up to scratch on what were inevitably fast-moving issues. To put it more bluntly--if you found them, they often did not know what they were talking about.

A case in point: I had been delegated, by the Minister, with responsibility for liaison on research and development (R&D) matters with the research community and industry. We scoured the landscape from coast to coast for months in vain looking for input into a proposed R&D policy. But I will tell you this--when

the policy was announced there was lots of input then. Everybody was out to tell you why they were "agin" it. The old Canadian way of closing the gate after the horse had bolted.

Which brings me to the question of when. When do you communicate your concerns? When do you lobby? When is the right time? Again, the short answer is early, yesterday, now! Even if there is no present indication of a policy shift, make sure that your concerns, your viewpoint are known, are on the record, and are understood in the right places.

One other question that deserves some comment--is lobbying MPs worth the effort? After all, given the centralized nature of the federal decision-making machinery, what is the point in talking to backbench MPs? My 5 years in Ottawa tells me that the MP route to government decision-making can be very effective, and also tells me that it is an amazingly under-utilized route. The outsider just does not realize the impact an MP can have, whether in government or in opposition, impact on the inside in the caucus, and in the corridors.

Without revealing confidences, just let me allude to a set of examples. We all now have our views about one of Mr. MacEachern's budgets--the first of two. We know the views of the business community. We, in our caucus, had some particular concerns about two or three items that we had heard were coming down the tube. Now, keep in mind that MPs who are worth their salt are normally very plugged in. They have a sense of what is coming down the tube very often. I remember John Evans, who was the Member for Ottawa Centre and who later became a Parliamentary Secretary to Mr. MacEachern, and three or four others of us had a breakfast meeting one morning and we decided that what we had heard we did not like. There were three particular items that we had to head off at the pass if we could. We devised a strategy and we pursued that strategy. I think there were seven of us altogether. We pursued that strategy in caucus and it worked. None of the three items, except with one qualification, showed up in the ultimate budget that came down. Now there is no doubt in my mind--because I remember some of the words that Mr. MacEachern spoke in that caucus and in subsequent caucuses--there is no doubt in my mind that the reason these things did not show up in the budget, the only reason, was because of that initiative that the seven particular MPs had launched quite unknown to the public. We could not go out and brag about it to our constituents, but we knew the deed had been done.

Now, I just cite that as one example of what can be done. You see, if you are a manager in an office and you have six or seven employees who come to you in a short space of time with any viewpoint, it takes a particular weight. So if you are the Minister of Finance, or the Prime Minister, or somebody who is concerned about cracks in a caucus, or concerns in a caucus, or keeping a caucus happy, and you get seven people who stand up in the course of an hour and a half, stating that they are concerned about this or that, and they want you to go in this direction, a message coming through seven times in an hour and a half is a fairly powerful message, particularly if the right people are delivering that message.

So I just want to reiterate before concluding, Mr. Chairman, the point that the MP route is a very good route. It is a route I recommend to you. It is a very under-utilized route. Indeed my principal recommendation to you is that the best route available to you, given its under-utilization, is the MP route.

Two stimuli

It is especially crucial that you package your concerns in terms of the MP's interests. An MP responds almost immediately, almost in Pavlovian fashion, to two stimuli; one is the concerns expressed by constituents (you have no idea how quickly politicians who are worth their salt respond to messages from back home). The other, if I dare be so candid, is opportunities for a favourable press. Now you may not believe the first because the popular conception is that politicians do not care much after they get elected until just before the next election; you may not believe the first and you may abhor the second, despise the second, but they are both true. So just put your disgust and disbelief aside and dwell on what the truth should mean to you.

The truth is that if you know that politicians react to concerns from constituents, enlist some of their constituents. Do not mimeograph the letter in Toronto and send it down with a 90-page bundle. Find some constituents in individual ridings who share and identify with your interest, and have the constituents put your case forward for you. If you want access to politicians, keep in mind that they will listen to their constituents, and keep in mind that the kind of items you are giving them ought to be opportunities for them to go public from time to time.

To return then to Henry Kissinger's dilemma, which I cited a moment ago. How can you talk to the whole Congress? How can you talk to the whole Parliament? You cannot and there is no need to. What you ought to do, it seems to me, is identify a selected few MPs whose interests are similar to your own. Build a rapport with them. Let them discover that your information is reliable. Do not neglect the two-way street phenomenon. Do not just expect information, be prepared to give some as well.

The secret of successful lobbying, of communicating your concerns and recommendations, is not unlike good fishing. Once you discover where the fish are, mark the spot well, and return there often.

Panel: Communicating about wildlife (7)

INTRODUCTION TO SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

J.A. Keith
Canadian Wildlife Service
Chairman

In Tuesday's session we had a very good start on the theme of the conference, "Communicating about wildlife". Not only did we hear a series of excellent tips and suggestions on how to communicate in different situations, but just by listening to the people doing the presentations we had a very good idea of what good communication is all about.

In this session we are going to start the first part with simply a summary of the keynote speech and panel. Don Dodds is going to do that for us, and then we are going to have three case studies. The point here is to look at controversial issues that have involved wildlife and that have flared up in recent years in Canada: to look at the role that communication has played in those issues--the negative and the positive sides, I hope--and so learn from them in terms of how we can best deal with the communication issues when such events arise again, as they certainly will.

Don Dodds was the moderator of the panel on Tuesday and was very ably introduced at that point by Joe Hickman, so I am not going to go over his well-known credentials for you.

Panel: Communicating about wildlife (8)

COMMUNICATION WITH OTHER RESOURCE INTERESTS AND DECISION-MAKERS
A summary of the keynote speech and panel

D. Dodds
Acadia University
Panel moderator

The theme of this conference is timely. Those in governmental agencies involved with wildlife administration, policy, and management in the past have often assumed that their programs were generally acceptable to the users of the wildlife resource, and that differences among professionals representing wildlife and professionals representing other land and water based resources were a part of the price one had to pay as a member of a profession dealing with a "luxury" resource, rather than one dealing with a primary resource base of major social and economic significance. The concept of marketing wildlife management programs, whether they dealt with regulations, introductions, habitat improvement, incentives, or preservation, was not given much serious consideration, and individual wildlifers tended only to respond to criticism and conflicts when they arose, often somewhat defensively.

Today we know that sitting back and responding is not enough. Rapid and mass communication techniques can spread local criticisms of wildlife programs and conflicts among resource managers across the nation and the world in hours. The diversity of wildlife publics has become (often) painfully apparent to the professional wildlifer. Some of these publics are non-consumptive users of the resource and some are consumptive users, while other individuals and groups are primarily non-users of the wild resource itself but maintain a strong interest in it, often exhibiting fixed convictions concerning the treatment of individual animals of one or more wild populations. And, as if these concerns are not enough, public servants responsible for our wildlife resource in some jurisdictions may find themselves unable to implement what they believe to be crucial research and management programs, because their budgets have either not kept pace with costs and needs or, even worse, have been cut.

The time to better communicate wildlife issues and needs has surely arrived, and with it the need for us to aggressively market the products of successful wildlife management practices.

There were two most important bits of advice for us in all the papers presented by our panelists. One was that the attitude of the wildlife professionals, in dealing with the farmer, forester, politician, and user, whatever that user's conviction might be, can mean some success or much failure in communicating our ideas. The second was that timing our communication early would improve our odds towards success, and that communicating our ideas too late would not only be ineffective but could increase the degree of conflict between the wildlife professionals and those they might wish to influence.

The panelists were remarkably together in offering us this advice; what they were all saying, as well, was that good wildlife communicators are respectful of others, listen well, are always well prepared, are available to those they wish to influence, and are certain of their factual base. These, it seems to me, were the important messages in which the panelists were in general agreement.

Now, I would like briefly to summarize the presentations individually.

The keynote address

The keynote speech echoed much sentiment within many of us. Mike Halleran noted that the period of extensive wildlife management prevalent in North American until now was on its way out, and the day of more intensive management was upon us, but that the success of that intensive management was dependent upon the control of wildlife management remaining with the professional. This control in turn, he indicated, was dependent upon increased public awareness brought about by the successful marketing of our management programs. Until now, there had been too much attention given to techniques or, at least, too little to communication.

The keynote address recognized the success of special interest groups, specifically animal rights groups, that espoused a narrower view of management than that we might exhibit, bordering on the laissez-faire and raising the spectre of management-by-lobby. (I think we can relate to this rather easily now, and perhaps add that the recent moose-season referendum in Maine and the trapping referendum issues in Ohio and elsewhere have sensitized professional wildlife interests throughout North America). Mr. Halleran referred to declining public support for management, and noted the importance of the media in helping mould public views on wildlife issues, sometimes to the detriment of the wildlife resource at stake. The address also included an important plug for integrated resource management and the need for improved social skills among professional wildlifers, as well as the implementation of negotiation and trade-offs in conflicts involving wildlife and other land-based resource management and development.

One of the most important points expressed in the address, in my view, was that it is species and populations that should come first in all our approaches to management and not the individual animal. This may seem obvious to us but, of course, it is an important and complex concept that has, of late, been reversed and rationalized successfully by special-interest groups more often than it has been communicated with success to the benefit of wild populations by wildlife managers.

The keynote address urged a higher profile for intensive wildlife management through improved communication, a mobilization of public support working through such groups as the Canadian Wildlife Federation, the use of television and other media, and the use of dedicated individual efforts on the part of all professional wildlife managers (or in other words, we are as professionals in this thing together).

The panel

Forestry

Bill Young emphasized the importance of the manager getting into the planning phase with wildlife input early. Waiting until forest operations were under way was clearly too late. Wildlife concerns should, however, interface at all three hierarchical levels in a government bureaucracy (or within industry): at the strategy level (relative to goals and objectives), the management level (relative to timber and pulpwood harvesting rates), and the operational level (relative to monitoring the results in relation to forest-wildlife management objectives).

Mr. Young indicated that an acceptable relationship between forestry and wildlife might be simply a matter of scheduling timber harvests in some instances and that, given the appropriate wildlife input, the wildlife resource could be benefited. Perhaps his most important advice for us came in the form of his "Youngometer", the attitude and personality meter which placed the bridge-building, positive shaker-and-mover with a sense of humour in a unique position to influence better forest-wildlife management, and assigned the spear-chucking, negative, humourless, bitcher-and-bawler to failure. He also emphasized the importance of our having our facts straight and at hand, and recommended that we strive for consensus at all three forest resource management levels: strategy, management, and operations.

Agriculture

Wildlife managers may have less room to manoeuvre when it comes to agriculture (compared to forestry), but Keith Smith gave us both the sobering facts of the need for intensive agricultural production on a decreasing land base combined with an ever-declining profit margin, and a clear message that, if the farmers could realize real benefits, the production of wildlife might not be entirely excluded from their operations. His presentation itself was a lesson in communication, and his video clips from the people's mouths were, I believe, extremely effective. What these people told us was this:

(1) The farmers must benefit from wildlife management practices (as well as the hunter).

(2) Actual dollar incentives from the use of land for wildlife equalling cash crop production were clearly attractive to the farmers.

(3) The farmers had more than an investment interest in their land; their land was much of their lives.

(4) The farmers knew their land and what was best for their land and their families.

(5) There must be mutual trust, co-operation, and understanding between the wildlife managers and the farmers, and for any success in integrating wildlife management and farming.

We are left with several points to consider from this presentation, including these:

(a) If soil and water conservation techniques can benefit both the farmers and wildlife populations, we were told to remind the farmers of this fact.

(b) We were advised to encourage research and land management in agriculture that might be less exploitive of the land base and more beneficial in improving management of soils. These practices, in the long run, could benefit wildlife resources.

(c) We were advised to help the farmers set aside land for wildlife, and promote measures to remunerate them for such practices.

In the area of communicating with the farmers, Keith Smith advised us to learn to understand them, to know who represented farming interests, and talk to them and to be certain that the farmers, especially the non-hunting farmers, were represented in wildlife operations. We were advised to make certain that the farmers understood that wildlife managers were for good conservation, but were not anti-farming. (I believe this is particularly important, and personally feel that farmers often tend to feel that we are anti-farming and against them).

Users

In dealing with public-interest groups, Monte Hummel warned us that "at its worst, communication is simply a matter of reinforcing prejudices. At its best, it is an exercise in mutual respect." He advocated an approach to communicating wildlife issues involving openness, mutual respect, getting all information on the table, inviting criticism (not an easy thing for anybody to do), and trying to solve the issues on the basis of having a mutual problem and a shared concern. Successful communication meant avoiding distrust, name-calling, and polarization, while assuming the best from those with differing opinions or, at the very least, giving them the "benefit of the doubt".

Mr. Hummel gave us his "speedometer theory of problem perception" (not terribly unlike the idea behind Bill Young's "Youngometer"), wherein we would recognize an easy solution at one end, a polarized stand-off at the other, and a large central area for negotiation and compromise. He urged us to try and move our perception of wildlife problems towards the middle of this speedometer. In addition, this presentation advised wildlifers to know their facts, avoid wildlife jargon in communicating, and learn to be brief and concise with their information.

Politicians

From some of you who deal regularly with elected representatives of government, Roger Simmons' candid advice may well prove helpful, even if you suspected the truth before his talk. He made two points early in his address:

(1) know what you want to say and why you want to say it, and

(2) be brief--no politician wants a bundle of paper--by definition, a brief is short.

In addition, he suggested that pressure tactics from anyone were not welcomed by politicians, but indicated very clearly to us that politicians desired and needed encouragement and help. He advised us to communicate wildlife interests early, before policy changes were effective, not after, and to inform MPs of our ideas in the ridings where the wildlife issues existed. When several members brought the same concern to caucus, something just might happen.

I think we were all impressed by Roger Simmons' two points near the close of his address--that elected members were most strongly influenced by issues expressed by or affecting their own constituents, and that they were also influenced by opportunities for favourable publicity. By tying your wildlife issues to the constituents or vice versa, and ensuring a favourable press for the elected member concerned, your communicating would bear the fruit you hoped it would.

In conclusion

I believe the presentations by the panelists struck some remarkably uniform notes coming from the variety of interests represented. I wish to congratulate the panelists and the Keynote Speaker for stating some of the problems in communication so clearly, and for advising us of what we must do to help guarantee the success of more intensive wildlife management, and thus our wildlife populations.

In the future, however, there may be even more than the fate of hunting, fishing, trapping, and healthy wildlife populations at stake as we move to improve our wildlife communication and marketing; there may also be our professions and our jobs. No doubt the seriousness of the present state of public awareness and understanding will be brought forth more clearly as this conference moves into the case studies which follow.

DISCUSSION ON SUMMARY OF KEYNOTE SPEECH AND PANEL

Yvon Dubé (Quebec Department of Recreation, Hunting, and Fishing) said he had listened to the speakers the other day and thought they had had a good resumé a few moments ago; nonetheless, he could not refrain from also giving a message. He had been in wildlife for 2 years now, and before that had always been in forestry and always had trouble with those "guys" in the wildlife service. He was wondering, at that time, what was going on that he did not understand, and he had to admit that he still had about the same questions as when he was in forestry. He said he did not accuse anyone, but was still asking questions and did not get very clear answers most of the time. The best answer he had received was: not to worry, it was complicated and they would fix it. After a year it was still complicated. His message was simple, he continued. They could not communicate with the public or with other departments if they did not put things straight in their own heads, if they did not accept the fact that they should relate to others, and if they did not make it simple. He suggested reading all the rules and regulations that they had in Quebec for fishing and hunting, and imagining the hunter and the fisherman having to read all that. He was sure no one at the conference had read it, the Minister had never read it, nobody had ever read it. How did they expect the poor guy, or the conservation officer, to do the job properly? He thought that maybe what he was saying now was a little bit out of order, but it related directly to communication. This was what he saw, and he would just like others to explain to him clearly that we was wrong.

J.A. Keith (Canadian Wildlife Service) said that Yvon Dubé had thrown down a gauntlet, and asked if anyone would like to pick it up. He thought that they all absolutely agreed with Yvon. Listening to the speakers in the earlier sessions, he believed that probably all present were reminded of their own tendency to hide behind complicated stories rather than making them clear and precise.

W. Young (Canadian Forestry Association of British Columbia) recalled a couple of speakers in Tuesday's session mentioning the need for new alliances. The gentleman from Quebec had triggered this again in his mind. He thought that the people of Canada basically were moderates and wanted a combination of benefits from the forest resource, talking in the broadest sense. There were natural alliances between wildlife and forestry, and natural alliances and new alliances that could be built up between agriculture, forestry, and wildlife. Keith Smith had mentioned the other day that the best agricultural land had been alienated for other purposes. Wildlifers and foresters should be supporting the agriculturalists, because sooner or later that pressure was going to be on the more marginal agricultural land; it was going to be on the best land for the growing of trees and for wildlife management. There would be a comfortable feeling for people in Canada, in each province, if these new alliances would spring up. Too often they retreated into their own little bailiwick.

It was like the Scottish clans when they fought the English, he continued, animosity between the clans was so great that they could not bind themselves together into one army a couple of centuries back. Too often wildlife biologists, foresters, agriculturalists and agrologists tended to fall into that pattern.

He suggested that nationally, as well as provincially, they should start embracing new alliances. It would give the people of Canada a comfortable feeling knowing that here was a broad group who had a basic consensus on good land use, good resource use. He thought that this would help in that whole communication pattern they were striving for.

J.A. Keith said that he was sure that was good advice. There was an inertia in institutional divisions that helped to keep them in separate camps. At the federal level, the Forestry Service had moved from being right next to them in CWS at Environment Canada into Agriculture Canada. It might have a good benefit there, and maybe that was where they should be as well. But he saw some very hopeful signs in the recent appearance of forestry/wildlife symposia--this seemed to him to be a very nice way of trying to build that kind of alliance. They needed to do the same thing with agriculture, and perhaps in a three-cornered way as well.

M. Halleran (British Columbia Wildlife Federation) said first that Bill Young and he did not write each other's material. If they happened to agree it was because they happened to have bled approximately the same amount in their defence of their respective special interests. The question of dealing with agricultural lands that had either potential or existing value for wildlife was something that he would just like to address very briefly. What they were really talking about was the dirt, the productivity of the land base itself. In British Columbia they were a little more fortunate than some provinces, because at least 92%, perhaps as much as 95%, of the province was still Crown land. It was still public land, but it was interesting that, while they had heard in Tuesday's session about the rate at which farmland was being lost due to urban sprawl and other kinds of human activity, in British Columbia the loss of forest land to agriculture was taking place at double the rate that their farmland was being lost to urban sprawl and other uses. Most of those losses were taking place on their better forest sites, with proportionate losses to all of the wildlife and other recreational values, because those lands were being converted from Crown land to private land.

His point was that those who lived in areas in which there was not as much Crown land should not assume that, because it was Crown land, it was not going to be under assault some day. It was all going to fall under some sort of contest as it became more and more apparent that the competition in the more densely populated areas intensified. They should all be prepared for the fact that they were going to have to defend Crown land values for renewable resource public activity and public uses--not wait until they fell under assault. They should develop their arguments and positions early in the game, because they were going to have to be able to deliver them in a rehearsed and prepared fashion. It was going to come, they could be assured of that, and they must not assume that it was not going to be under contest merely because it was not at the moment.

He also referred to far northern areas. People were building recreational honky-tonks on pieces of country in British Columbia that were, in some instances, a hundred miles from the nearest road; fly-in helicopter skiing and alpine hunting camps, and all of those kinds of things. That was all going to impact on the wildlife manager and his resource. So the Crown land issues that they

had facing them today were absolutely vital. They had to make sure that they had good arguments ready, because all of them were going to have to address them in all of the country.

Case studies of communication (1)

INTRODUCTION OF SPEAKERS

J.A. Keith
Canadian Wildlife Service
Chairman

Now we are moving into what I would describe as the meat of the program. We are going to look at three case studies and apply our ideas and those of our speakers to what we can learn from those studies: how they worked out in terms of communication, what we can learn for the next time around in terms of communication, and how to do it better.

We are going to start with a case study on sealing in Newfoundland, and afterwards go on to the forest spray program in New Brunswick, and lastly the wolf control program in British Columbia. I am going to hold a discussion period at the end, not in between.

Our first speaker is David Quinton from Newfoundland. David is remarkably equipped to talk with us because he spans both sides of this set of skills. He is a wildlife biologist by training, but he is also a broadcaster, and a very successful one, so we have somebody who understands both sides very well. As a student, he studied wildlife biology and worked on caribou and beaver with Tom Bergerud and Don Dodds. He was then an extension biologist with the Fish and Wildlife Division under Dave Pike in Newfoundland. From there he moved into broadcasting in the days when the CBC was beginning its work in Newfoundland. He was in at the beginning of the "Land and sea" television program. He then became its producer and writer, which he is now. He has also tracked the sealing issue in a personal way and through his program since it was initiated, and it is that story that he is going to talk to us about.

Our second speaker, Tom Crowther, is from Fredericton, and he is a very busy and distinguished person. We are very lucky to have his time. Tom has been in the newspaper business for 40 years. He is now President and Publisher of the "Daily Gleaner" in Fredericton and the "Atlantic Advocate". He is Chairman-elect of the Canadian Daily Newspaper Publishers' Association. He is a Director of the Canadian Press. He is also active in community affairs, Chairman of the Board of Theatre New Brunswick, Director of the Protestant Orphan's Home, and so on. He is also a very active Anglican; in fact so active that he is irreverently known in New Brunswick as "the bishop's bagman".

He is speaking about the New Brunswick forest spraying program in relation to communication. I was associated with the spray program back in the 60s, and it will be fascinating to hear it from his point of view.

Our final speaker, to give us our third case history, is Allan Murray, who is well known to many of you. He was born and educated in Manitoba and was a school teacher for a few years. That is where he started learning how to communicate. He was a reporter with the British United Press and with the "Winnipeg Free Press". He spent 20 years with the Manitoba Department of Natural Resources, first as Chief of the Information Program and later as Associate Deputy Minister. He is the first Canadian President of the American Association of Conservation

Information. His latest job was Assistant Deputy Minister for Environment in British Columbia. With a great smile, he left the bureaucracy in 1985 and is now free to wheel and deal as I know he likes to do. I always remember Al Murray as the person who, when we "Feds" went to meetings that involved Manitoba, would come out with the most original thought and say it very clearly and very well.

Case studies of communication (2)

NEWFOUNDLAND SEAL FISHERY

D. Quinton
Television producer
CBC, Newfoundland

To ask a Newfoundlander to analyze the recent destruction of the harp seal fishery in a dispassionate way is to ask a lot; for a native son, no matter how thorough his training in academic disciplines, cannot easily step out of his skin nor abandon his culture. For though like most Canadians I enjoy a steak sizzling on a barbecue, I also enjoy a seal flipper pie.

Like most other Canadians I have thrilled, at one time or another, to the exploits of Robin Hood and Wayne Gretsky, but I have other heroes--Abram Kean and Billie Knee the jowler (successful master of a sealing or fishing vessel), and countless others--friends, neighbours, relatives who fought their way north through the ice-floes in search of seal. The stories told in my childhood ring through my ears to this day: the voyage north, the excitement, the danger, the drama, the heroism, the tragedies. The seal fishery, like the cod fishery, is part of my background, my heritage, my culture, and I am fiercely proud of it.

Canada is not a homogeneous nation. We are a mixture of many peoples, many cultures, and this should be a strength, not a weakness. I have seen, in my corner of Canada, a tyranny of the worst sort. I have seen a gentle people, who live as hunters and fishermen, ground into the dirt, their way of life crippled by a massive urban propaganda campaign of staggering dimensions.

The soil is thin where I came from, the climate severe, the land poor. Yet the sea is rich--rich with cod and capelin and lobster and herring and seal. Without the seal the land would not have been settled. It has been important and, at times, vital to survival. As a people we accept the killing of seals, just as we accept the killing of cod fish and spring lamb and Colonel Sanders' chicken. So it is with some dismay that in a few years we have seen our seal fishery destroyed, our way of life disrupted, and our name vilified throughout the world.

So, as a Newfoundland wildlife biologist turned journalist, I face a challenge now in presenting some thoughts and observations on how communication affected the outcome of the recent sealing controversy. I find it difficult to be objective because as a Newfoundlander I feel hurt and betrayed; as a biologist I feel dismayed and frustrated; and as a journalist I feel disillusioned and shamed. I feel that a grave injustice has been done to my people and to the people of the northern part of this country, especially our native peoples whose survival as a hunting community has been threatened by the environmental and animal rights movements.

How the sealing evolved

Well, now that I have confessed my personal bias, perhaps I can proceed in true scientific fashion--objective and detached, unemotional--in this brief post-mortem of the seal fishery and the communication process that led to its demise.

To understand the communication process, some of you probably need some background information on the harp seal and the way the seal fishery has evolved. The harp seal herd in the northwest Atlantic today numbers between 2 and 3 million animals. The adults swim southwards each winter ahead of the advancing arctic ice pack to the Gulf of St. Lawrence and an area off the northeast coast of Newfoundland commonly known as the "Front". Whelping takes place on the ice in March. The pups, or whitecoats, grow quickly, more than quadrupling their weight in 10 days. At 10 to 14 days of age they are weaned and abandoned by their mothers. As the white hair is gradually replaced and the dark spots appear, the juvenile seals pass through several phases and are known in the Newfoundland vernacular as "ragged jackets", "beaters", and then "bedlamers". Eventually, with maturity, the distinctive harp-shaped markings appear on the back. At 4 years of age the harp seal is sexually mature. It is a long-lived species reaching ages of 30 or more.

Each adult seal eats about 1.5 tons of fish a year. The herds' consumption is slightly more than is caught by all the nations fishing in the northwest Atlantic. But we hunt seals not to eliminate our main competitor on the high seas fishing grounds; we kill them to make money from their pelts and their oil, and to eat them. In Labrador and in the Arctic they are still used to make clothing, especially skin boots, or "skinny woppers" as our grandfathers called them.

Sealing is deeply rooted in Newfoundland tradition. Harvesting on a commercial scale began several hundred years ago when fishermen-settlers first began occupying our northern bays. Indeed it is the opinion of some social historians that the Islands probably would not have been settled had not the seal been available to supplement the seasonal cod fishery. The statistics seem to bear this out. In 1857 seal pelts and oil accounted for 24% of our exports. In its heyday, about the middle of the last century, 13 000 men went to the icefields on over 600 vessels. This must have been about half the adult male population of our northern bays. It was a hazardous voyage in the early days. Every year there were casualties, and often there were grim dramatic tragedies where hundreds of sealers were lost. However, going to the ice was more than a hunt, more than a fishery. True, the few dollars were important after a long hard winter, but there was camaraderie too on the ships, excitement and danger and drama in ploughing the wooden walls, and later the steamers, through the heavy ice floes, and in stretching yourself to the limit on the ice in a frantic attempt to bring home a bumper voyage of seals.

However, with the 20th century came technology and over-exploitation of the harp seal. Steel vessels replaced the wooden walls; steam replaced sail. Wireless was introduced. Spotting planes were sent out on some of the ships as far back as the 1920s. You did not know that Newfoundlanders had the world's first aircraft carriers, did you?

Suddenly we Newfoundlanders were not the only ones interested in harvesting the harp seals. With the depletion of the seal herds in the White Sea, the Norwegians began sending ships. France became interested in the seal fishery, so did the USA and the USSR.

In the early 1950s, just after Newfoundland joined Canada, concern was voiced about the uncontrolled harvest of seals on the high seas. A full-scale study was made, which indicated that too many seals were indeed being taken. Recommendations were made that a quota system be established. But the world was not

quite ready to manage the seal fishery. Remember, this was back in the 1950s. Most of the seals were far outside our 3-mile territorial waters. The 200-mile limit, which we now take for granted, was then beyond our wildest dreams.

Remember, too, that back in the 1950s, wildlife management was still a relatively new word and ecology was mentioned only in narrow academic circles. The principles of conservation were known and accepted and, as I recall, symbolized on the Girl Guide badge by contour ploughing. We were still spraying with DDT in those days, and Rachel Carson had not yet written "Silent spring". The public was not yet tuned in to the significance of wildlife research and management--nor were the politicians.

Efforts by concerned Canadian scientists to control the harvest of seals met with little success, mainly because European members of the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization could not agree on a formula. Why? Was it a reflection of the mood of the times--the general lack of awareness and concern for environmental matters? Was it because government officials were simply talking with other government officials--an international debating club with no real clout and no real political will? Was it because the public had not yet been involved in the issue? Or was it a carryover of the age of ruthless exploitation of our natural resources? For it seems that while the principles of conservation and management of birds and mammals on land were at least beginning to be accepted, the high seas were lagging far behind.

We are talking now about the 1950s and 1960s, a period when the waters off the coast of Newfoundland and Labrador were raped and pillaged as never before. In a decade or two, foreign fleets decimated the largest body of cod in the world. Our own vessels wasted and depleted haddock stocks until this species was commercially extinct. And similarly, on the ice floes, the seals were being slaughtered wantonly. An orderly, traditional hunt by skilled professional ice hunters from the northern bays of Newfoundland had become an uncontrolled international bonanza.

Newfoundlanders, Nova Scotians, Magdalen Islanders, and Norwegians converged on the herds. The Russians sent a 7000-ton icebreaker and two giant helicopters to ferry men to the seals; 150 other planes and helicopters were used in the hunt. Many men, inexperienced in the killing and skinning of seals, joined in the kill. By 1964 the seal hunt was out of control. It was bedlam. It was chaos. There was over-hunting. There was waste.

Into a new phase

Enter the conservation groups and the humane societies. They began to visit the icefields at hunting time and they did not like what they saw. There was shock, horror, outrage; and rightly so. Something had to be done. Representation was made to government, and now that the public had spoken it would seem that the response was immediate and positive. After consultation with all concerned--the sealers, the sealing industry, humane societies, the Audubon Society, and others--regulations were introduced to shorten the season, license the sealers, and restrict the use of aircraft. A new club was introduced for the killing of seals, designed and approved by humane societies. Quotas were established in the Gulf, the only region at the time within our territorial waters. In other

words, every reasonable effort was made to scientifically manage the seal herds and to ensure that they were harvested in as humane a manner as possible. End of story? No, it was the beginning; at least the beginning of the communication part of the story, for the eyes of the world were only now beginning to turn on Canada and its seal hunt. Gradually newer more militant groups were emerging to crusade against the seal hunt, and the media were there too to play their role to the hilt. It was a symbiotic relationship if ever there was one--the protesters and the media working cheek-by-jowl, each feeding on the other.

You see, the baby seal had become a holy grail of the crusading protesters. It was tailor-made for the new animal rights movement. It was bait for the press. Cute, fluffy, white, cuddly, helpless, big brown eyes upturned, facing a bloodthirsty killer with a club--then skinned alive for the giant Norwegian furriers to clothe the pampered rich bitches of Europe. Beautiful animals, white snow, red blood--to the protesters what an effective propaganda tool, a symbol, a flag to rally around; to the media, what copy! And so, in the cities of the world, a propaganda campaign of staggering dimensions began to feed its message to an unsuspecting world. And on the icefields off Newfoundland a media circus played to a full house. Sophisticated urban commandoes in orange survival suits were on the white, heaving ice fields; self-proclaimed priests of the new order chaining themselves to the giant ships, risking their lives to save the baby seals from extinction.

To a newspaper man in Texas or a TV producer in Germany this was heady stuff, great copy. Then, when Princess Grace Kelly of Monaco and Princess Paula of Belgium lent their support, and actresses Yvette Mimieux and Brigitte Bardot joined in, well you can just imagine the excitement in the news-rooms of the world. Sex had been added to the blood and death of the innocents on the white arctic snows. For a propagandist the scenario was irresistible. Serious, experienced journalists saw through the emotional rhetoric and media grandstanding, but many did not or pretended they did not. Supporters of the seal fishery did not have much of a chance. Scientists had to be truthful, accurate, and careful. The voice of reason and the arguments of wildlife biologists and other government spokesmen seemed cold and dull, mechanical, lifeless, in the face of the unrestrained rhetoric of the anti-seal protesters. "According to the Assistant Deputy Minister of Fisheries the seal herds are increasing" does not exactly reverberate around the news-rooms of the world. Brigitte Bardot cuddling a baby seal does. Paul Watson chaining himself to a ship is a hero. A sealer with a club and knife is not. The medium is the message, remember.

The "20-year war"

But let us now back up a way to trace the strange communication process that led to the "20-year sealing war". The first real word on the need to control the seal hunt seems to have come from the Fisheries Research Board in 1956, when after years of study it announced that the harp seals were probably being overexploited. Not exactly a clarion cry, but you scientists know the constraints of your profession. Without adequate study and data you cannot really speak with certainty. Quotas were suggested, politely, but the European countries who then were outside Canada's territorial waters could not agree on a formula. The slaughter continued.

Scientists estimated in 1964 that the herd was down by 200 000 animals--a significant but not startling drop from 1.5 million 14 years earlier. Still, the warning sign was there. The hunt was really out of control. The voices of the scientific community had been raised, but they were careful, cautious voices and they were unheard. It was a different matter when the public became involved, when humane societies visited the hunt. Then the message rang loud and clear, and politicians sat bolt-upright and began to listen and to act. They responded to the united cry of the Audubon Society and the humane societies. Within a few years new rules and regulations were in place to control the hunt. Population studies were intensified and a new management scheme was put in place. Humane societies designed and approved a new and more effective club for killing seals. Soon the harp seals were perhaps the most intensely studied and managed animal species in the world. A conservative quota allowed for gradual rebuilding of the population. All should have been well, for no one is against conservation. In fact, many Newfoundland sealers joined Greenpeace in 1976 in a joint effort to establish a 200-mile limit to protect offshore stocks from the Norwegians. No one--Newfoundlanders least of all--could argue against conservation, for practical reasons if for none other.

Then somewhere along the line the protest movement got the bit between its teeth and began to believe its own propaganda. I suppose, though, there was more to it than that. A new movement was sweeping the cities of the world. In the cellophane-wrapped, antiseptic urban centres a new philosophy of animal rights had been born, and was embraced by many who originally merely wanted to save the seal from extinction. Many are still caught up in this new thinking, this new attitude to nature. Some have embraced the animal rights movement with a religious fervour. They will not eat meat. They spit on those who wear furs. They paddle out to play flutes to killer whales, who, incidentally, eat seals with a vengeance. It is a powerful movement, a successful movement. Built on emotion and misinformation it has propelled a propaganda campaign that would make Goebbels hang his head in shame:

- Blatant lies echoed around the world - "Newfoundland sealers harbour a dark lust to kill", "Seals are tortured beyond belief", "Seals are skinned alive".
- One hunter was paid to torment a seal for a film-maker's camera.
- Supermarkets in the USA and Britain were blackmailed into banning all Canadian fish.
- Pups were sprayed with dye to render pelts worthless.
- Gruesome effigies of Canadian sealers were displayed in London.
- And finally the European Economic Council (EEC) was persuaded to ban the import of Canadian seal pelts.

There was no effective counter-lobby. Scientists and government spokesmen, as mentioned, had one hand tied behind their backs. They could not resort to the same tactics. They had to stick to the truth, however dull. The fishermen and hunters were too few, too poor, and too remote to mount an effective campaign of their own. Rod-and-gun clubs were not concerned really. The seal is not a game species. Many wilderness and humane societies and natural history clubs, embarrassed by the tactics and the double standards of the protesters, disassociated

themselves but the damage had been done. While the protest movement failed at home it succeeded abroad. It ruined the overseas market for seal pelts.

Native peoples and others reply

Actually, I suppose it was probably a no-win situation anyway. How can you make what is essentially a slaughtering operation look good? How do you gently kill a seal? How do you skin it without showing blood? How do you explain the way of life of a rural hunting society to those who live in a comfortable, closeted, cellophane-wrapped "Irish Spring" world? Possibly the only ones who can communicate this effectively are the sealers and the native peoples themselves. When a group of Inuit hunters from Labrador addressed the Commission on Sealing last month the room was full. You could have heard a pin drop as the hunters simply and eloquently told about seals--about what seals and sealing meant to them.

In terms of communication it was equal to a hundred official reports. Native peoples are, I suspect, the Achilles' heel of the protest group. Even rabid protesters must squirm when Inuit and Indian hunters tell of the terrible havoc brought upon their societies because of the animal rights movement.

An Inuit group and the Canadian Sealers' Association are said to be largely responsible for turning the tide against the protesters in a meeting of CITES (Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species) in Botswana, 2 years ago. Just imagine--Inuit hunters from the Arctic travelling to the edge of the Kalahari Desert in Africa to dissuade the Germans, the English, the Uruguayans from placing a growing herd of 3 million seals on the world's endangered species list. I have never heard anything so ridiculous in my whole life. Are you getting the feeling, biologists, that somehow your message did not get across?

Did these countries not hear the factual information given by Canadian scientists and government officials over the years, or did they choose not to hear? Even with the native delegation there to dramatically present their side, and with strong diplomatic manoeuvres by the Canadian government, the vote was 27 to 23 with six abstentions.

Alan Hercoviki, whose book "Second Nature" I have drawn upon heavily for this presentation, says:

> It was soon clear that few delegates had heard anything but the anti-sealing side of the story. Many were surprised to learn that the native people still trapped and hunted in Canada. Few small countries can afford thorough research or even to send delegates to the hundreds of conferences that now determine international policy on a host of issues including conservation and wildlife management. Animal rights groups have seized this opportunity to provide such countries with research materials and position papers.

Research materials, position papers? I thought that that was your game, biologists. I have not seen any of these research materials or position papers. For some reason I am not on the mailing list. I probably shall be after this.

What could have been done to combat a well-heeled propaganda machine of these dimensions? Several biologists and civil servants scored notable successes in public debates. A couple of pamphlets were distributed, and to the everlasting

glory of the Fisheries Department they were with the sealers all the way. Articulate voices were occasionally raised, and several editorials and articles defended the sealers. A group of Newfoundland actors called "Codpiece" satirized the protest industry. Yet it was not enough--not nearly enough to combat the avalanche of propaganda put out by the protesters: films, pictures, petitions, letters. In the war of words the protesters won hands-down. Government officials and scientists were sitting ducks. You cannot fight rhetoric with facts. You cannot show a pleasant picture of an animal being killed. Yet how hard did we really try? There was not one government person working full-time on the sealing issue. One group of protesters alone had a staff of 30 people throughout the world. A factual booklet was not distributed by one government department because it was too inflammatory. It was not inflammatory, it was gentle.

A matter of language

Overwhelmed with public opinion the European community banned the importation of seal pelts. For the seal industry it was game-up. They could not beat us at home but they beat us abroad. The protesters won through the skilful use of rhetoric and propaganda. Those in favour of the seal fishery apparently were not very effective in communicating about wildlife. It is not really surprising, perhaps. Official statements and news releases are often incredibly dull. There is nothing more abhorrent to the press than dullness. Bureaucratic "buzz words" abound. Biologists are trapped by their own vocabulary--even relatively simple words and phrases, "TAC", "MSY", interface, and limiting factors. Sorry boys, but these are ugly words. In one report I read that seals were exsanguinated. Thanks to my ancient Roman dictionary I finally figured it out. Why say "air-sea interface" when "top of the water" will do? But don't worry, you aren't the only culprit. When your general screams "commence rear demobilization tactics", he means run for your lives.

In the use of words though you can never match the propagandists blow for blow. The titles of their articles and films alone show this:

- Murder island
- The slaughter of the baby seals
- The last seal pup
- Canada's shame
- Canada's bloody business
- Savage luxury

In describing their own activities the protesters came up with such heroic titles as:

- Warriors of the rainblow

In the publication of the same name, Robert Hunter gives a revealing summary of tactics used in the Greenpeace anti-whaling campaign:

> All I had to do was make sure never to quote myself. Instead, I invented quotes, placed them in the mouths of agreeable crew members, then reported to the outside world what they had said. As a journalist, I was a traitor to my profession. As news manager for the expedition, I could control the shaping of our public image. And when things got slack, I could arrange for

events to be staged that could then be reported as news. Instead of reporting the news, I was, in fact, in the position of inventing the news, then reporting it.

That is what you are up against, folks. The whales may have been a legitimate cause on the Pacific coast--I do not know. But I do know the tactics are reprehensible, and I do know that the seals followed the whales, and it is not over yet.

Today around Newfoundland I see beautiful seal pelts floating in the landwash, discarded because they are worthless. But worse than this I see a proud, gentle, hospitable people maligned and hated throughout the world by the dissemination of lies. I see native peoples in Labrador and throughout the Arctic crippled by yet another form of foreign imperialism--their cultures, their belief in the right to live off the land shattered.

It is not right! A grave injustice has been done. There has been a war--a war of pictures and words, a communication war. And the other side has won.

In looking over this I fear I have perhaps strayed somewhat off-course. Yet, perhaps not--for in this particular communication story the main chapters have been written by the protesters. And this has at least given some idea of how they told their story.

Case studies of communication (3)

NEW BRUNSWICK FOREST SPRAYING

T. Crowther
Publisher
"Daily Gleaner" and "Atlantic Advocate"

It was an Irish politician who once explained: "Half of the lies they told about us are not true." I believe that sums up the problems inherent in the position of publisher of a daily newspaper and a monthly magazine; we have to live with everybody's second opinion.

When readers see an article in the newspaper they read that supports their point of view, they immediately feel an affinity for the writer or the newspaper. However, when a few days later there is another article that does not follow the same theme, the reader then feels that you have become a deserter and a betrayer of the cause. Readers do not draw the subtle distinctions that newspapers do. "If you are not for me, you are against me" is the attitude of most who feel bitterly abandoned when a newspaper stops short of endorsing the reader's position on an issue.

It was, therefore, reassuring for me when Merrill Prime wrote to me about this conference. He told me that the overall conference theme was "Communicating about wildlife", and that he did not want a partisan type of presentation on the relative merits of the New Brunswick forest spray controversy. Rather, the conference committee was anxious to have an analysis of the case in such a way as to demonstrate the critical bearing that good communication (or bad communication) can have on an issue, and how the outcome of that issue can turn upon the strengths (or weaknesses) of the communicators, as much as upon the scientific merits of their position.

With this background, I will endeavour to give you a fair and objective commentary on the New Brunswick budworm spray program.

Background to controversy

Aerial spraying to control spruce-budworm damage in New Brunswick began in 1952. It has continued almost annually ever since. The spruce budworm is the most destructive forest insect in North America, and it has been confirmed that it is threatening the whole of eastern Canada's forest economy.

One must understand that Canada's forest, stretching from Newfoundland into Alaska, represents the second largest coniferous forest left on this planet. It is exceeded only by the forests of Siberia in Soviet Russia. About half of the forest in New Brunswick is Crown land and therefore owned by all citizens of the province. The remainder is in the hands of 10 pulp-and-paper companies, together with large freehold properties that are owned by about 500 people.

At the outset of the spray program, which began in 1952, there was general public support for spraying because of the importance of forestry to the New Brunswick

economy. The forest provides approximately one-third of all manufacturing jobs and two-thirds of the province's exports. About 33¢ of every dollar generated in the province comes from the forest industry. The spray program was seen to be keeping the trees alive--and this meant security for the approximately 15 000 jobs that are dependent on a healthy forest industry.

There was concern in the 1960s about the use of DDT, but this was dissipated when the government banned its use. In the early 70s, a small but highly vocal group of citizens started questioning the spray program and its effect on the environment. Those people believed that the program was polluting the forest areas of New Brunswick and would be detrimental to the health of animals and humans.

It was in 1976 that emotions akin to panic started stirring, both in New Brunswick and in Nova Scotia, when a report became public suggesting a possible link between certain spraying materials and Reyes Syndrome--a children's disease. This came as a result of a 4-year study, undertaken by researchers affiliated with the Dalhousie University Medical School at Halifax, and it raised doubts about the safety of a number of widely used petro-chemical solvents involved in diluting insecticides for forest spraying programs.

The researchers had undertaken an investigation after seven youngsters from New Brunswick were treated at the Sir Isaac Walton Killam Hospital for Children in Halifax. All were suffering from Reyes Syndrome and four of the seven died. The outcry was immediate and sustained. Emotions were so strong that many people were close to panic. In fact, the outcry was so intense that Dr. Crocker, head of the research project on Reyes Syndrome, said: "We didn't expect this. We would have preferred to wait another year to get more work done so that we would be in a better position to demonstrate things."

After the story broke in the media, Dr. Crocker spent much of his waking hours talking to reporters, Cabinet Minister, health officials, and other individuals in an effort to tone down public reaction to the rumoured health hazard. As the publicity flowed from day to day, another alarming aspect of this situation became known. It was revealed that, within the New Brunswick political circle, something had been known about the Reyes Syndrome research since 1972--4 years earlier. New Brunswick, in fact, provided more than $100 000 in funds for research into the disease in a hush-hush operation.

This, of course, was an aspect of the budworm spraying program that was not public knowledge. Even the Minister of Natural Resources for the province claimed that he knew nothing of it until the publicity broke in the media.

It can be argued that the government was dealing with raw research on which there had been no conclusion reached. It can also be argued that until such time as there is substantial evidence of a connection between the budworm spray and Reyes Syndrome, it would be premature to release any information to the public. That is simply one side of the story. The other side, of course, is that when it is revealed that the government has known something of vital interest to every citizen for a period of 4 years, without making this knowledge public, it reinforces the growing conviction that the government had something to hide. When secrecy replaces revelation, some balance is lost in the decision-making process.

Active concern

The Reyes Syndrome scare engulfed the three Atlantic Provinces. The damage had been done. A loosely organized group was formed and it called itself the "Concerned Parents' Group". It circulated petitions and was reported to be receiving feed-back from some 50 to 60 groups throughout the province.

The government moved quickly to try to contain the damage. It appointed a panel of experts to examine the evidence and to report back to the government as quickly as possible. The New Brunswick Minister of Health reported that the conclusions of the experts should be in the hands of the government by the end of April 1976, and that the report would be made public.

Subsequently the report found that there was no evidence directly connecting the spray program with Reyes Syndrome. This was rejected by the Concerned Parents' Group, and the controversy continued.

The government established a 1-mile setback from any residential area as a buffer zone that could not be sprayed. As a result of this setback regulation, the Concerned Parents' Group initiated a number of legal actions in which it alleged violations of the Pest Control Products Act--in other words, spray planes had not respected the 1-mile setback. The charges and counter-charges continued, but experts eventually were able to ease the controversy with a variety of facts. Dr. George Becking, a federal toxicologist, stated that to blame the spray program for Reyes Syndrome did not explain why most of the cases tended to cluster around January and February, when spraying did not take place.

While that, of course, did not convince those people violently opposed to any spray program, the weight of evidence seemed to calm the public concern. But a new one was in the wings. Early in 1980, it was suggested that there could be a link between the spray program and the incidence of cancer.

The New Brunswick government had learned a lesson from the Reyes Syndrome experience. It immediately established a Task Force under the chairmanship of Dr. Walter O. Spitzer of McGill University. The Task Force report, made public in March of 1984, suggested that there was no evidence to link the incidence of cancer in the province to the spray program.

Reassuring the public

The controversy surrounding the spray program in New Brunswick is a classic example of Aristotle's theory of argument, in which one argues: "On the one hand ... but on the other hand". The environmentalists argued strongly against any spraying of the forest, and they claimed the high ground of defending "the public good".

It became essential for the forest industry to respond immediately to defend the spray program, and to reassure the public that there was no health hazard. The government and industry marshalled their forces and used experts as speakers at various functions--and these experts were made accessible to the media.

It soon became clear, to any fair-minded person, that there were as many environmentalists within the forest sector as there were in the environmentalist groups. The large body of experts within the forest industry came through as being just

as concerned about health, and the protection of wildlife, as any other group in society.

I recall attending a function in New Brunswick at which the Deputy Minister of Natural Resources was the speaker. Listening to him speak, what came across was a sincere concern for the forests, the environment, the animals, and the humans that could be affected by the spray program.

Dr. Baskerville, an expert in the forestry sector, wrote a report in which he made the point that if scientific information was to reach the public at large, it must do so through the media. He went on: "The media have become the filter through which information necessary to enhance public understanding of the budworm/forest problem, or any natural resource management problem, must pass."

The point I have been trying to develop is that full revelation of information can sometimes alter circumstances. And when secrecy replaces revelation, some balance is lost in the decision-making process.

After 22 years as Britain's royal press secretary, Sir Richard Colville explained: 'My job is, for the most part, to keep stories about the Queen out of the press." More than anything else, perhaps, that explains the adversarial relationship that exists between a free press and the establishment, whether that establishment be regal, political, or bureaucratic.

It is the purpose of newspapers to publish in the interests of the public. It is the purpose of those who protect the establishment to see that the only information published is helpful or flattering to their position. Therein lies the twilight zone of the free press, and therein lies the battle zone on which we will always fight over the stresses that philosophically divide the free press from those who wish to restrict the flow of information.

Lesson learned

The New Brunswick government learned from the Reyes Syndrome controversy that every charge against the spray program must be answered, with factual information, from individuals who are perceived to be independent.

In the southern area of New Brunswick, centred mainly around Hampton, was a very strong group connected with the Concerned Parents' Group. While there has been spraying of the forests in southern New Brunswick, by far the majority of the spray program is carried in the northern part of the province. I recall Aurelle Furlette, who was president of the Papermakers' Union at the Canadian International Paper plant in Dalhousie, making this point as he expressed support for the spray program.

The results of all this is that the public controversy has quieted. Through effective communication in the mass media, people have generally accepted the need for the spray program while still retaining a significant measure of concern.

Wildlife seems to be plentiful in the forests throughout New Brunswick. In fact, the deer herd is reported to be in excellent shape and birds abound.

Speaking as a newspaper man of some 40 years, I can assure you there can be no substitute for an informed public, on any issue involving the public good. I believe the Government of New Brunswick came to realize in the issue of the budworm spray program that factual information, supplied to the public through the media, was the only means by which the public concern could be answered.

There can be no compromise on that fundamental principle in a free, democratic society.

Case studies of communication (4)

WOLF CONTROL IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

A. Murray
British Columbia

I stand here before you with no jokes to tell. Life in British Columbia these days tends to be a bit humourless. The following account, however, is an account of a comedy--a comedy of communication errors.

Three objectives of the wildlife program of the British Columbia Ministry of Environment are:

(1) to provide recreational hunting opportunities throughout the province,

(2) to manage wildlife resources for certain economic benefits, and

(3) to control problem wildlife.

Within this context the Ministry undertook a wolf control project that resulted in considerable public controversy. The project, in simplest terms, was to kill large numbers of wolves so that there would be larger populations of ungulates for hunting.

Wolf control is not new in British Columbia. In the late 1940s, quarters of horse meat laced with strychnine were dropped from aircraft onto frozen lakes. As many as 2100 of these bait stations were established in a single year. In recent years, populations of ungulates in portions of northeastern British Columbia have declined, not to the point of being endangered, but to a level that could lead to reduced hunters' success. Some northern guides, trappers, and hunters immediately harked back to the old wolf-kill remedy. After several experiments with wolf control, some of the Ministry's biologists came to the same view; the wolves must be controlled. In fairness though, no one recommended using poisons.

Two areas in northeastern British Columbia were chosen. Both areas support some part of the business activities of about nine guide-outfitters, whose main source of guiding income is from "non-resident alien hunters", who make up about 50% of the hunting effort in that area. Both areas lay within the electoral constituency of the now former Minister of Environment, himself a northerner and a hunter. He was subjected to considerable personal abuse because of these two facts.

In the Kechika area, the Ministry started an experimental wolf kill program in 1982-83, scheduled to last for 5 years. It aimed at an 80% reduction of the estimated 500 wolves in the area. From January to March, guide-outfitters, flying their own planes at their own expense, would fly out and spot packs of wolves. Ministry wildlife staff (a biologist and a technician) would then take off in a helicopter and shoot the wolves with shotguns. In the first year of this program there was no public outcry, probably because the project had not been announced in southern British Columbia and there was no publicity about it.

How the news broke

There was an encouraging increase in survival of calves the following summer. In year two, the project took more wolves--and still no outcry, still no publicity. The results were even more encouraging, so the Ministry set up an operational wolf control project in the Muskwa area, just east of the Rockies. The method of operation was to be the same, but the guide-outfitters and the British Columbia Wildlife Federation offered to share the cost of the government's activities, as well as to do the spotting of wolf packs at their own expense. To do this, they sponsored a lottery, duly licensed by the British Columbia government. The prize was to be a hunting safari in Africa.

It was this lottery that really brought the project into public view. The story first broke in the "Alaska Highway News" and was sent by a local citizen to a "Vancouver Sun" reporter. It was not until several weeks after the uproar started and the public disclosure of cost-sharing was made that the government announced that it was paying all the costs itself, except for the spotters. By this time it was widely "known" that two vested interest groups were helping finance the project. The Ministry's late denials did not dispel the earlier beliefs which persist, I think, to this day.

In recent years, North American society has taken quite a charitable view of the wolf and its role in the wilderness. This view was enhanced in the winter of 1983-84 by the appearance on the silver screen of the film, "Never cry wolf"--an anthropomorphic tale about wolves, taken from the fictional account of the same name by Farley Mowat.

The wolf control program hit the media with a vengeance in January 1984. The Ministry had not made any public information available, nor did it have a press release ready at that time. The Minister was out of the province when the story broke and so was unable to respond immediately to the questions of reporters. Even the technical plans and reports on which the project was based were not ready for public distribution and were not released until 20 days after the "Vancouver Sun" story broke.

The central government information service, which is different from the Ministry's minuscule information service, dithered about releasing factual information on short notice, despite a Ministry request to do so. Eventually a release was issued, but it failed to satisfy the information appetite of the aroused media--aroused, in large part, by the intercession of Paul Watson and his associates of the Project Wolf coalition, a group which opposed the wolf hunt for a variety of reasons.

Mr. Watson was well-known across Canada and abroad because of his much-publicized activities in the anti-sealing and anti-whaling campaigns. He was regarded by many as a true conservationist, as was Farley Mowat. Both men know how to exploit the media, and both are highly articulate spokesmen for their cause, unhampered by a high regard for the facts of the case.

Many of the facts were contained in four draft technical manuscripts that were still undergoing final editing at the time of the disclosure of the wolf project. When these were released in photocopy form, they drew sharp criticism from a number of quarters, but particularly from the Wildlife Society of Canada and

from the Wildlife Section of the Canadian Society of zoologists. Both groups challenged the quality of the data used as the basis for the projects, and they challenged the analyses of those data carried out by provincial staff. This scientific criticism added fuel to the fire already being fanned by Mr. Watson and his followers.

Selling the project

Once the story had broken and provoked this ferocious and unexpected response, the Ministry flew the biologist in charge of the program to southern British Columbia, where he was a guest on a number of hot-line shows, both on radio and television. He comported himself quite credibly. This campaign to sell the project, however, got a poor send-off when the Minister, on the advice of the government's--not the Ministry's--public relations experts, walked out of a jammed press conference after stating that the program was government policy and he would leave the technical questions--like who was paying for it--to his technical advisers, who were sitting on either side of him. Television cameras recorded his departure from the poorly conducted press conference.

This did not endear him to the reporters, who had legitimate questions to ask him about the project. The same Minister had himself written a letter to a citizen--a member of an animal protection group--describing the wolf as "one of the most dangerous, vicious, wasteful, and unrelenting killers in existence". That phrase quickly became public knowledge, and came back to haunt the Minister in dozens of letters from citizens who opposed the project. It also caused the Ministry considerable problems, because Ministry policy is to manage and protect, as necessary, all species including the wolf. In some areas of British Columbia the Ministry had already protected wolves against any kind of harvest, trapping or hunting.

The controversy was continued when Mr. Watson and some of his followers declared their intention to travel to the control area and get between the wolves and the shooters. This was a strategy that apparently had some success in the anti-sealing campaign, but it had little hope of success in the 38 000 km^2 of wolf control area. However, it did attract media and public attention. A mixed but generally hostile reception in Fort Nelson, the northern town that was the centre of the project area, attracted the ire of the anti-control groups, which claimed that the biggest guide in the area had engineered the hostility towards the media.

In any event, Mr. Watson and friends did not succeed in getting near the actual killing grounds. But, from a publicity point of view, the tactic was extremely telling and the reaction of pro-control people towards the "wolf lovers" further strengthened the latter's resolve to continue the opposition. It seemed at times that there were as many media people in the north as there were protesters.

Midway through the season, Project Wolf--"a coalition of conservation and animal protection organizations", which is their description of themselves--asked to meet the Minister to present him with a petition bearing 30 000 signatures, and to discuss the control project with him. The Minister refused such a meeting and this was capitalized on by Project Wolf people in their fund-solicitation newsletters.

For and against

All in all the Ministry of Environment and the Ministry of Tourism have received more than 3000 individual letters plus ten of thousands of names on petitions. The letters were split about 90% against the project and 10% for it.

The letters from British Columbia residents were less opposed to the hunt, with northern rural writers generally favouring the project and urban writers being opposed to it. The writers were generally adults, judging from the handwriting, and they represented all walks of life, judging by the notepaper, which ranged all the way from fancy embossed letterhead to scribbler paper.

An unknown number of letters to editors were written and an unknown number of telephone calls of protests to Ministry officers were received. The wolf control project was the subject of the CBC's Sunday afternoon call-in show, "Cross-country check-up". Those opposed to the project called in greater numbers than did those who favoured it. On local talk shows, when Ministry staff appeared to answer questions, there were fewer "for" than "against". As time went on the media coverage dropped, but the protesters continued their activities and letters to the government continued to arrive all spring and summer.

By the fall of 1984 there was virtually no media coverage because nothing was happening in the control areas.

In November 1984, in a spur-of-the moment political telecast--it was a paid political telecast--the Cabinet Minister who was supposed to appear for some reason could not. My previous Minister did appear and was faced with the question of whether the wolf program would continue. The Minister announced that it would; the wolf program would start up again in January 1985. Meanwhile, the regional biologist responsible for the program had already started opportunistic killing of wolves while conducting the fall monitoring surveys of ungulates. It had been a Cabinet decision not to take the initiative in a public information campaign. The Minister's announcement caught everyone, especially the Ministry, unawares and unprepared.

This immediately brought the issue back to the front pages. It also reactivated the Project Wolf forces, who distributed a newsletter appealing for funds to the 30 000 people who had signed the petition that the Minister had refused to receive. The newsletter contained a number of errors of fact that had now become conventional wisdom.

Meanwhile, Paul Watson decided to pull out of the campaign and leave it to others. It says something about the quality of British Columbia journalism when that decision drew a banner headline in the "Vancouver Sun"; obviously that day in late 1984 was not a good day for news. The successor to Mr. Watson was named and the Project Wolf group continued to do its thing, but some of the zip had gone out of the campaign.

The group announced an alliance with groups of northern British Columbia Indians, who were going to be the ground forces to stand between the wolves and the gunners. This alliance was obviously thought to be a good tactic on the theory that generally the people who support wolf conservation also tend to support Indian rights movements.

Meanwhile, in the summer and fall of 1984, the Ministry redid its technical reports, taking into account some of the criticisms levelled against them by the scientific community. A multi-page document tying the four reports together was released, and a 4000-word booklet about wolf management was prepared and printed, but when I left British Columbia a few days ago, to my knowledge, it had not been released. Remember that this program started in 1982-83. This booklet was to put into perspective, for the first time, the government's position on predator control. This should obviously have been done long before the project started.

Lessons that emerge

This whole experience was not a happy one for British Columbia and, in my view, was not a beneficial one for wildlife management in Canada. When Rich Goulden asked me to give a talk about the wolf control program, he said that I was neither to attack it nor defend it, but to draw what lessons I could from it that might be of help to others in the wildlife community. I have broken the lessons, as I see them, into two categories:

(1) Country-wide, resource-wide wildlife lessons that we must co-operatively try to handle; and

(2) project-specific lessons that can apply in varying degrees as we carry out the wildlife activities throughout the country that we all carry out each year.

(1) Country-wide, research-wide lessons - Several things became quite clear to me from the correspondence on this matter:

(a) We oversold the balance-of-nature theory. There is a wide-spread belief that if we leave things alone, "Mother Nature" will look after them quite well. The fact that man has already intervened virtually everywhere in the world seems immaterial to proponents of the nature-knows-best theory.

(b) We oversold the theory that predators only cull the old, the lame, and the sick, and that their efforts strengthen the herd and improve the gene pool.

This was a recurring argument, probably the single most recurring argument, found in all correspondence we received for leaving wolves alone.

(c) We oversold the endangered species story. It was widely believed by our correspondents that we were exterminating an endangered species. At last guess there were somewhere between 6000 and 8000 wolves in British Columbia--a population that was doing very well. We have not sufficiently distinguished in the public mind between local abundance and site-specific shortages. Wolves are endangered in Europe and in the USA (except Alaska); they are clearly not endangered in British Columbia. There are wolves virtually on the doorstep of the province's capital.

(d) We are coming too slowly to the realization that the animal protection groups are a global, if unstructured, community, and that wolf control in British Columbia can stir up anti-trapping sentiments in Frankfurt. As Barry Commoner said in the "Closing circle": "Everything is hooked to everything else". I think that is certainly true with animal protection groups.

Their communication networks are virtually unlimited, and this becomes a major factor in shifting the balance of power to people who hold "urban" values.

(e) We have relied overly much on scientific, rational, logical arguments. We have failed to recognize the emotional aspects of these crusades and we are ill-equipped to deal with them.

We have self-righteously emphasized the "bio" aspect of "biosociology". I think that Dave Mech's book, "The wolf", is clearly the most comprehensive current biological work on the wolf. It was rarely, if ever, mentioned by our correspondents, but Farley Mowat's fiction--"Never cry wolf"--pulling as it does on the heart-strings, was constantly thrown up as the book that should guide our wildlife management activities. Mowat and his ilk understand what turns people on. We do not seem to have a good grasp of that.

(f) I think we have underestimated the growth and intensity of the anti-killing groups. They are an international community of believers, and we had better recognize their size and their ability to arouse opposition--and get media attention--on matters of vital concern to us. As wildlands become scarcer they will become more valuable, and the anti-killing movement will get stronger.

(g) We have not adequately educated the public on even the rudiments of population dynamics for wildlife. If we hope to undertake more sophisticated management techniques, we will have to inform the public so that they can understand what we are doing and why.

(h) Many wildlife managers have not accepted the fact that a growing number of citizens do not believe that wildlife management should be directed solely, or even as much as it is, to the demands of the hunter.

In my view, the whole wildlife management community should be concerned about these eight items, and a concerted effort should be made to develop a plan and implement it to cope with them. It would be a mistake to think that we can bully our way through project after project and not end up losing in the long run.

(2) Project-specific lessons - We also came up with a few project-specific lessons, many of them so fundamental that I hesitate to raise them here, but I will:

(a) I think it cannot be stressed too much that we must develop a public information plan tailored to cope with the kind of problems likely to be engendered by a sensitive management project. Such a plan should be based on an honest presentation of the facts.

It should anticipate the kind of public reaction to expect, and it is wiser to overestimate the reaction than to underestimate it. Generally speaking, those in the wildlife management field are not accurately attuned to society's values. We need more broadly based reference points to get a truer reading of where society is at.

(b) We should list the people who are likely to object to any given proposal. This is not as hard to do as it sounds if three or four thoughtful people put their minds to it.

(c) We should ask ourselves what kind of objections they are likely to raise. What is the basis for their objections: is it scientific, ethical, etc.? We cannot counter an objection until we have clearly defined it and the grounds on which it was made. If we can do this in advance, we can significantly reduce the impact of the objections or even eliminate them.

I suspect that hardly anyone in this room has heard about the "Nimkish wolf control program". This program is also in British Columbia, within 100 miles or so of the capital of Victoria, where the Ministry has been trapping wolves and killing them--not in large numbers as in the north, but in significant numbers--for the last 4 or 5 years because they were a significant threat to deer on the Island. This project was successful because it was preceded by a lengthy consultation process: discussion with all interest groups, Greenpeace and Sierra Club included. They were given all the facts as they were revealed by the biologists. The scientific material was published, so that it was not in question. That project rolled along very nicely and no one heard any complaints about it.

Preventive medicine

Once we have anticipated who may object and why, we have to seek a way to get to them with offsetting information--preventive medicine, as it were. This requires a good knowledge of media techniques and a good knowledge of the media. I think the media are not always a knight on a white horse.

I recall, some years ago, I worked on a Winnipeg newspaper that every Christmas would put on a campaign to get gifts for poor folks. On this particular Christmas they sent a photographer/reporter out to one of the local Indian reserves to get some pictures to dress up this appeal for gifts. He went to this little Indian reserve, which was typical of many of the prairie ones--it was a pretty run-down kind of place. He got a bunch of pictures, none of which were very exciting. As he was leaving he saw this little girl looking at him. She had a doll in her arms and she was a doleful little creature with big black eyes. He went over to her and took the doll and tore its head off. He gave her back the doll, took a picture of her, and the paper ran a story, and the cut-line was: "All I want for Christmas is a head for my dolly". I can tell you that newsroom was chock-a-block full of heads of dolls and bottoms of dolls.

The press, you know, has to be understood if you are going to deal with it. It also requires that we start our planning early enough to put our campaigns into effect. One way to help do this is to bring together the main objectors and lay out the problem as it is developing, as we did with Nimkish; lay out the problem long before we start laying out a solution. A steady diet of good information to the right groups and individuals will go a long way to reducing later opposition. I think this is so vital that I would recommend the delay of a project where necessary to provide enough time for this public awareness to take place.

Our experience indicates that it would have been useful to enlist the local university gurus who are always contacted by the media if there is a comment required. You can go to your own communities and you know who will be called on by the press for any given kind of a problem. There is sort of a standard list of gurus they must paste in the back of the style manual: "If you have a problem with health, phone Dr. Smith and Dr. Jones. If you have a problem about

agriculture, phone Dr. So-and-So". You need to get to these people and get them on-side early on.

It is particularly vital that these "intellectual" commentators be not able to criticize the quality of the scientific basis for your project. British Columbia suffered considerably because its technical material had not been well handled and its failings-- real or imagined--cast doubts on the Ministry's scientific credibility. Even if the science had been impeccable it would not have eliminated the opposition, but it would have been one less problem to deal with and would have freed valuable staff time to do other things.

I think it is essential to designate a media contact person who understands the media, who can relate well to them, and who is fully informed on the facts. Such a person can then keep the Minister's office informed, so that the Minister is not taken by surprise by those roving microphones that seem so common these days in the halls of our legislatures. There are good programs available to train staff on how to deal with the media and how to behave on radio and television. We should see that staff has this training.

Unforeseen effects

One of the things that British Columbia did not anticipate was the impact of the northern wolf kill on the Vancouver regional office. That office, which had nothing to do with the wolf kill, was deluged with phone calls that it was poorly equipped to handle, due to a shortage of staff and a lack of adequate information.

Neither had the Ministry anticipated the kind of international furore that would erupt. The result was that Canadian embassies in a number of countries, and Canadian consulates, were flooded with questions on which they had no information. It was only at the 11th hour, maybe it was the 13th hour, that British Columbia hastily dispatched briefing material to these places. We had not anticipated it, and we were not prepared for it.

One of the home truths that we all know, but too often forget, is that secrets cannot be kept secret for very long. Confidential memos are soon public documents. Loosely written memos and letters can reappear at the most inopportune time. I think staff really have to understand that fact. They must be careful in what they commit to paper on some issues.

Finally, in this list of miscellaneous lessons, our media material must be good-quality stuff. A few extra dollars on hand-out material is repaid many items over by reduced demands on staff time later on. This is especially true in preparing good letters for the Minister to sign. British Columbia found it could not cope with the flood of letters because it was not prepared for them, and there was indecision for a while on whether we should even answer them. A public information plan would have prepared for this.

My view is that all letters should be answered as promptly as possible, and that each reply or acknowledgement should contain an attractive, readable and credible explanation of the project. Modern letter-writing technology makes it much easier for governments to answer letters with substantive replies. Citizens are entitled to that.

In conclusion, let me make these recommendations:

(1) For specific projects - develop a public information plan. Spend enough time on it to ensure that it includes all possible contingencies and methods to cope with them. Make sure you start it soon enough for it to be implemented effectively. Make sure it is written down and followed. The techniques for planning an information program are well known, and later in this session Carl Radimer will discuss some specific techniques.

I think what we need is not so much technical advice but the willingness to take public information planning seriously. It is usually the first item cut in our budgets, and it is usually the budget that is the smallest to start with. I think it is important to remember that it is the wildlife manager, not the PR guy, who gets the blame when the flak starts coming in due to poor public information and planning.

In the wolf control program British Columbia probably got what it deserved, because it did such a ham-handed job of handling public information.

(2) For the overall wildlife management concerns - I think this meeting, or a subcommittee of it, or some delegated group, should do a thorough problem analysis of the kinds of items that I identified earlier on, and should make some detailed recommendations on a public information program to be undertaken by all of us in a co-ordinated way to deal with them. I think this will require some good public-opinion polling and some good marketing advice. To my knowledge governments do not have that kind of expertise on staff, nor should they. I think the wildlife community should go to the private sector and buy the skills and knowledge it needs to really address this threat to wildlife management.

Of course, this will cost money and the implementation will cost even more money. But, at the moment, I think the most important ingredient is the realization of the magnitude of the threat and a willingness to tackle it in a sophisticated and effective way. I do not believe Armageddon for wildlife management is just around the corner, but it may well be only a couple of blocks away.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION ON CASE STUDIES

K.A. Brynaert (Canadian Wildlife Federation) said that he would like to refer to comments made by Al Murray with regard to distortion in the press. The Canadian Wildlife Federation was the beneficiary of some of this distortion. It was alleged by Farley Mowat that CWF sent the wolf control program $250 000, with which they hired helicopters with machine-guns mounted in the nose, and went out and killed 483 wolves. He wondered, just for the record, if they ever got the cheque. (Al Murray replied that they never did.) He asked if CWF ever promised a cheque. (Al Murray replied that CWF never did.) He then asked how the program had made out with the 483 wolves. (Al Murray replied that they had got them.) Good, he said.

D. Munro (Canadian Wildlife Federation) commented that those three presentations had been superb. He did not know when he had heard three that he had enjoyed more. There were certainly some common threads that ran through them. One in particular was that, with respect to each issue, the antagonist group was extremist or fanatic. He thought it is almost a truism that they did not argue with fanatics; did not become involved in a logical and reasonable exchange of views with the object of trying to clarify the situation--it did not work because the others did not want them to. This seemed to him to be a very great dilemma.

He thought that Al Murray had presented a number of exceedingly useful prescriptions for avoiding falling in the hole, but there might be occasions when, despite their best efforts, they did fall into it. He had some concern about the problem of what to do to try and get out of the hole. It had been suggested that the media did not serve them very well and maybe they could not expect it to, because the media responded to its audience--at least to a degree. The media tended to emphasize the dramatic, the negative, and the emotional. How was it possible, he asked, to make factual information with respect to good resource use, which was what they were interested in, emotionally appealing? Could they make it emotionally appealing? Were there aspects of human behaviour that they had not been able to identify and reach out to in trying to put forward their side of the story, which was good resource use, be it wildlife or soil or forests or what have you? Should they concern themselves, as a matter of high priority, with trying to understand better how to reach people and influence them? Was that perhaps not the most important research that they should be undertaking? He really felt very concerned that somehow or other the good news was never news, that somehow or other the practical proposals for constructive public service were unexciting and therefore did not get known, did not receive support. What could they do about it?

There was a final point, he said, that some of them may have seen the exchange of letters in the "Globe and Mail" over the past 10 days or so, which indicated what perhaps the next focus of this sort of controversy was going to be--the caribou in northern Quebec and the proposal that there should be some commercial use of the herd. Paul Watson allowed that he was not going to meekly accept the commercialization of use of some of the caribou herd, and there was a response from Mr. Burnet of the Canadian Arctic Resources Committee to the effect

that he could not understand how Paul Watson could have such contempt for the Inuit, how he could display such a lack of feeling and, in effect, an antagonism towards them that even exceeded that of the earliest missionaries. So there was a nice little controversy perhaps building up there that those concerned should try to prepare themselves for--he was sure they had. He did not know, he said, how to conclude this "cri de coeur", because he felt that they had to somehow or other find some new way that they had not yet found of getting their point across, despite the excellence of the presentations at this session.

Tom Crowther ("Daily Gleaner" and "Atlantic Advocate") replied that he was tempted at the outset to make a distinction between the television newscasts and a newspaper, but he would not do that. He thought that it was very necessary for all of them to have a very healthy respect for the sensibility of the general public. They were going to have the extremists making outlandish claims one way or the other. An answer that was rational, understandable, and emminently fair would eventually convince the general public, who really and truly were quite sensible and solid in their approach to information. He thought that they should not overlook that fact.

A.F. Frayling (International Fur Trade Federation) said that he would like to address what he had to say largely to the gentleman from Newfoundland who had told them about the whitecoat seal, and very ably done and most interesting it was. But he wanted to say first of all, as this was his fourth conference of this nature over the years, how utterly refreshing it was that at long last they realized that they had a problem. For many years those who were engaged in the sale of the product, to which he had devoted his entire life, had felt that the total lack of interest displayed by Canadian government official representation overseas was little short of disgraceful during the past 10 years. For instance, when the whitecoat business was at its height and the writing was on the wall, he had been interviewed by a very senior person in Canada, and his remarks were: "Frayling, I am surprised at you. Are you really impressed with the antics of all those film people? I am astonished! Forget it, my boy, and go on with the selling of the seals". Now that kind of attitude was deplorable but, to be perfectly fair, it seemed to have been corrected.

How they might be able to learn from that whole dramatic episode--and it was dramatic for people who were engaged in the fur business--was this. The gentleman talking about the sealing business gave some very interesting news about the longish period in which there had been too many seals taken in the open sea, and that there had been an unnecessary slaughter. That sequence never really impacted on the fur public or the general public. It was not until the fact that the animal was killed in babyhood--the baby, the cuddly, beautiful, big-eyed creature with the white coat--that the method of killing with this wretched club became publicly popular news. That was the death of the seal business.

As they probably knew, he continued, Denmark, or Greenland, was very concerned with the seal business and had decided to meet that threat by sending a party of Inuit and government officials around Europe--each meeting being sponsored by the ambassador in the country concerned--and they made their play, which was that they did not touch whitecoats, that it was illegal to handle baby seals, and therefore it was utterly iniquitous that they should be branded with the same

brush. The outcome was utterly and completely useless; the damage had been done; seals were and continued to be totally unsaleable. They might know that, at the recent auction in Copenhagen, there were only two buyers present and the sale was stopped after 10 minutes because one of them had bought the one bundle he wanted for museum purposes. It was death to the seal business.

Now as the method of killing was the medium on which the press immediately hung their case, aided and abetted by television, it alerted interested parties--and there were said to be 84 welfare groups in Europe currently operative at the moment--it alerted them to finding out how other animals were killed. In consequence, they now had the campaign against the leg-hold trap, which he could assure them would leave the whitecoat seal thing far behind. They should have no doubt about it; this was big, big news to the media. Now there was the headline: "We always knew it was beastly but here is the evidence". So, all he was saying was that the theme of their very interesting week was "Communicating about wildlife", and it was never more essential that communication be not only introduced but stimulated, otherwise he could assure them that a commercially viable trade in fur-bearing animals was in its last few years.

D. Quinton (CBC TV, Newfoundland) said that he agreed wholeheartedly with what Mr. Frayling had said. One of the things that he had noted, being a Newfoundlander, and working and living in Newfoundland as a broadcaster, was that there really was no issue. There was no sealing controversy in Newfoundland; the total protest movement there consisted of 12 people. So in his own TV program he was preaching to the converted. It was on the international scale that the damage was done, and he had often wondered, if the whitecoat had been black or had a head something like a rat, would that sort of thing have happened. He guessed the answer was no.

A. Murray (British Columbia) said that his response to Dr. Munro's question about how to tackle the problem was that one of the things they could do was bring some new skills and some new disciplines onto their side. He recognized that among the hard scientists, the physicists, the mathematicians, and so forth, sociology might be regarded as a quasi-science, but it was the best that they had, and he thought they should use people like that. There were marketing techniques that they should take advantage of, just the same as they took advantage of helicopters and goodness-knows-what. He did not think they were doing it; the sociology part of biosociology had escaped them, and they needed to be not so self-righteous about their own total knowledge of everything, but get those other guys in to give a hand.

The second point he wanted to make, referring to what Mr. Fraying had said, would reveal perhaps some of his own true colours. It was his understanding that the people who were opposed to leg-hold traps made their first approach to get governments to do something about banning the leg-hold trap in 1929, and if it had taken governments 56 years to do something about, they well deserved what they were getting.

A.F. Frayling remarked that it was even worse that at the end of 56 years nobody had been told that they were doing anything about it.

W. Young (Canadian Forestry Association of British Columbia) said that he thought the wolf situation in British Columbia and the seal situation in Newfoundland had a great similarity. He then put a question to David Quinton. They were talking about the method--whether it was helicopters with people leaning out with shotguns shooting wolves, or whether it was clubbing little seals with a club, it was the method. He was convinced that most Canadians would agree to managing the population. So, was any work being done on other methods than clubbing a little seal? Could they shoot it in the head with a .22? Was there not some other way to pacify this protest and bring together the majority of Canadians who were moderates in accepting management of the seal herd?

D. Quinton replied that he had not got the detailed information in front of him, but to the best of his knowledge there had been intensive studies on various ways of killing whitecoats, and each time the conclusion had been that clubbing and skinning was the simplest and safest and best and most effective way. It had been studied by international groups and by veterinarians who had been sent out on the ice by different countries. Kirk Smith, who was in the audience, was more familiar with it, but everything the speaker had read on it indicated that clubbing was the best and most humane way of killing seals. Other ways had been tried, guns had been tried, he believed, and even acoustics, but that was by far the best and most humane way.

K. Smith (Fur Institute of Canada) responded that it was important to distinguish that that opinion came from a scientific point of view, but that it was irrelevant from a public relations point of view.

D. Quinton said that, in other words, perhaps if they killed them less humanely, the public would not raise a furore.

K. Smith replied that they had done some experiments with a pistol, but he guessed one could not trust oneself on an icefloe with a pistol; one might slip and shoot oneself in the foot, and so on. But, if they were playing the public relations game there as well, and people recognized that an alternative method would be the way to save the industry, that was what could have been tried. Now obviously it was too late.

T. Crowther, referring to the spray program, emphasized that there was still concern about the spraying of chemicals to control the budworm. The provincial government had recognized that fact and researchers were working very hard to come up with a method whereby they would mess up the sex life of the budworm and thus eradicate it. It seemed a little difficult, but then again it had to be done; they were looking at that method of controlling budworm, and he thought it had an application to everything else.

A.J. Macaulay (Ducks Unlimited Canada) said that he tended to share Dave Munro's mixed emotions about their prospects. He agreed with the suggestions that Al Murray had just given, and wanted to offer a theory on why those suggestions were necessary. It seemed to him that there were basically two types of

personalities. There were the people people, and then there were those people who chose wildlife or something else to work with because they did not like working with people. Those in the wildlife profession had been fairly roundly criticizing themselves at the conference, justifiably so, and what they had seen in that series of revelations about their lack of success had been their failure to recognize their own shortcoming, which was that they were not good people people. They were not good at anticipating problems and coming up with solutions beforehand; they reacted when the situation got out of control. For that reason, he heartily endorsed Al Murray's suggestions. They needed a different type of person to complement their technical expertise, because basically wildlife management was 90% people management; that was really what they were hearing.

R. Morgan (Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters) said that David Quinton had talked about very carefully choosing their words. Then, in Al Murray's very excellent presentation later on, he had heard the term "non-resident alien hunters". Aliens to him were something that they were afraid of, or they hated, and yet there they were in the context of communication using a term that put those very hunters, whom he assumed the British Columbia tourist trade depended on, in a bad light. Perhaps if the word "alien" was currently used in communication, they had helped make that problem even worse. He also heard the word "anthropomorphic" all the time, and that was fine within the context of that room, but whenever he used it in talking with the general public, they did not know what the heck he was talking about. So they should try to use words like "humanizing" animals; the public could understand that.

David Quinton had talked about the problems that he had encountered; including "Canada's shame"--obviously sealing was very bad. Why did they not use words like "Canada's pride" and "Canada's heritage" when talking about the great seal hunt that had been carried on for so many years? He heard that,probably under the title of "An economic evaluation of the seal industry", a report had gone out. Maybe it should have been called "Canada's heritage", and then be explained. He suspected that there were probably reports that came out of British Columbia that said "Results of a study to examine predator-prey relationships". Maybe it should have said "Saving Canada's big game".

When Al Murray talked about hiring professionals to communicate, he was right; obviously it was necessary. The problem that governments faced, though, was that when they hired professionals to communicate, the public felt they were bad, that they were merely trying to sell the "poor public" on their program. It was not public information; it was swaying the public for political gain. He thought that it was another problem to overcome, and he did not have the answer. But, when he read a personal opinion in the newspaper, obviously that had got to be honest, gut information; it was not the government trying to sell him an idea. That was the perception of the general public. So, as they looked at hiring outside firms or outside consultants to help with their communication, they had to look at how to overcome that very problem, because consultants might help to get their message across to the Canadian public, but the Canadian public might not trust the message that they were receiving because of its source.

Al Murray had talked at least twice in his address about fund-raising--that the Project Wolf people were out on fund-raising campaigns--he supposed direct mail and other things--saying "This program is terrible; send us money". He was of the opinion that there were a number of people making a great deal of money out of the "anti" movement, and perhaps they were motivated more by greed than they

were by concern over any particular species. He said he was wondering if they had any handle on how much money the "antis" raised in that particular movement, and how much they spent.

A. Murray replied that he did not know how much money they raised--there was no public revealing of the books. His understanding was that certainly in the second year of their campaign they were having trouble raising money. After Paul Watson had left, they seemed to have difficulty. The impression he got was that it was never a very successful campaign from the point of view of raising money. It seemed to be running on a bit of a shoestring most of the time.

Turning to the "non-resident alien", he said that one of the folk back home had read a draft of that paper and had said that it was accurate, but "alien" was not a good word to use. He had used it only because that was the word in the regulations. "Non-resident alien" referred to anyone who was not a Canadian. Rick Morgan was right in saying it was a bit of an inflammatory word.

The other point Rick Morgan had made was about hired hands to help them. He was advocating that they got advice of that sort so that they could better do their job. Governments were always hampered by the kinds of things they could say and the kinds of things they could do, so it would never be easy for governments to combat that kind of thing. It was much easier for interest groups who could somehow establish the fact that they were credible, even though they might have vested interests, e.g. the rod-and-gun clubs.

The last point he wanted to make was that he would be interested in knowing on what basis Bill Young had made the statement that most British Columbians, and indeed most Canadians, supported wildlife management. He did not think they knew that. He had a hunch that most Canadians did not give a damn, and a good many of them did not support it within the context of what they meant wildlife management to be. He thought that it was comforting to believe that they cared, but he did not think there was any evidence that that was so; if there was, he would be interested in seeing it.

T. Crowther said that he had some problems with respect to hiring public relations firms. He asked all of those who were interested in wildlife if they had ever taken any group of media people out into the field to explain to them on site precisely what they were doing.

J.A. Keith (Canadian Wildlife Service) thought the short answer to that was in some cases "yes", but obviously not enough.

M. Halleran (British Columbia Wildlife Federation) said that he was really intrigued by how many of the people taking part in that conference, apart from those members of the "fourth estate" who were there, were people who had worked in media at one time or another. Many of them might have heard an echoing of a sentiment expressed to him by a nasty city editor whom he had worked for. In advising him on how to more properly adjust a lead on a story he had written, the editor said that he should always appreciate that it would be impossible to sell a story that began by saying, "Hotel Vancouver did not burn down today".

What that meant, of course, was that some things were news and some things were not. One risked, when one attacked an institution like the press, the label that one was anti-media or did not believe in the maxim of a free press. There was a suggestion that the public got the kind of government it deserved. He submitted that the public got the kind of press it deserved. David Quinton and he had know one another for 18 years. They had met in the Agriculture Resources Department of the CBC, which in British Columbia had seven full-time people in 1968-69 programming agriculture resource questions specifically. When he left in 1980, he was the last one--none of those who left were replaced, and today in British Columbia there was not a single full-time resource specialist in the CBC. He said that he would like them to examine those statistics because they existed almost uniformly across the country. He would like them to ask themselves whose fault it was.

K. Smith said that he supported a number of the speakers and a few other people who spoke about the need for more public opinion and consumer research. It was absolutely fundamental that, before one could mount any kind of communication strategy, they should know what people were thinking and where they were coming from, and have a profile of the various audiences they were trying to reach. Just by way of illustration, he said, there was a study that had just recently been completed, looking at Canadian attitudes to wildlife management and, in relation to that, the seal hunt. It might come as a surprise to many people that, if asked the question the right way, over 80% of Canadians supported the continuation of the seal hunt. At the same time, if asked whether they thought baby seals should continue to be bashed over the head, 85% would say no. Canadians supported, in the 90% numbers, the basic principles of wildlife conservation and management. They supported the principle of continuation of the seal hunt provided that several basic criteria were met, which he thought would be much the same for many other industries:

(1) That they perceive the method of killing to be humane--it did not matter, in fact, whether it was or not--it must be perceived to be humane.

(2) The species must not be perceived to be endangered in any way. In fact, in that study only 14% of Canadians to this day were convinced, in their own minds, that the harp seal was not an endangered species. Somebody did their job!

(3) They must be certain that full use was made of the resource where possible, that all by-products were used, and that it was an ecologically sound and well-managed harvest.

(4) They must be assured that the people needed the work. This was important to them, particularly when it came to the Inuit and the fishermen, the little people in society.

They certainly gained from that sudy, which was national, cost to the tune of $50 000, and was funded by the Department of Regional and Industrial Expansion and the Fishermen's Union in Newfoundland. It consisted of a Gallup-type poll and focused on group studies in four cities. Substantial information had come from that. He thought that could assist many additional studies in the same area. It was fundamental that they did that kind of work, knew their audience, and developed a communication strategy based on some sound scientific populations and some ideas from the people they were trying to reach.

R.K. Smith (Agricultural Extension Centre, Brandon, Man.) wondered if there was an analogy from an agricultural point of view. Some 15 years ago, a friend and himself had taken a sound-film camera with a long mike-cord and gone into a suburban Fort Garry, Winnipeg, Safeway store. The price of food had taken a little jump pretty well across the board at that time. They asked 13 people that day what they thought of the price of food and who was responsible for it in their opinion. Everybody thought the jump in the price of food was terrible, they were very upset about it. They did not know that he and his friend were with the Department of Agriculture, but not one person said the farmer was responsible. There were the unions, the truckers, the retailers, and the wholesaler. Farmers thought that everybody blamed them for the price of food. In truth, that was not the case. He did not know if there was an analogy there with wildlife information or not. He then asked Al Murray to what extent the opposition party in a province was helpful or a detriment in a controversy like that. Did they try to fan the flames? If they did, was there something that could be done to maybe alleviate that or deal with it in some way?

A. Murray answered that he did not sit in Cabinet, so he was not privy to all the things that went on there, but his understanding was that both the Social Credit Government and the NDP Opposition were split down the middle.

To make a point to Tom Crowther, he said that he did not want to be cast as someone who vilified the press, because he had spent too many years as a reporter and too many subsequent years defending the press. Certainly if any of them had been a city editor and had sent their staff out in the morning and had 12 columns that were blank, and they had to be filled by 11 o'clock when the presses started to run, they could understand the anxieties that the editor had. And they could understand the anxieties of the reporter who had to get some information and was told, "I am sorry, Mr. Jones is not in and I will take a message"--and they knew that Mr. Jones never answered. When faced with that situation, one did what one could with what one had, and it might be an old press clipping that one rewrote. There was some benefit to being open with the press.

His final point was that, to take the other side of the story, he would be interested to know if Tom Crowther's paper, or how many papers in Canada, had environment/conservation writers. It seemed to him that all of the outdoor columns in this country were "me and Tom went fishing and we got this big fish". To his knowledge, there was not one good knowledgeable specialist in that area, the way there was in the business field, medical field, etc.

T. Crowther said he thought that was absolutely correct.

I. Stirling remarked on a comment that Tom Crowther had made about whether or not any of them ever dared to take a real live reporter out into the field with them. In the work that he did, mostly in the North, they had in fact gone out of their way to do just that. It was an extremely valuable and rewarding thing to do. He had yet to have a person out there from radio, the press, or TV who did not, in fact, get really interested in what was going on, and it was found that if they could ask straight questions and get straight answers, they gave a lot of coverage. He still continued to do that. One of the reasons that it had worked reasonably well for them was that they had not tried to tell the media

what to write. They had had a lot of encouragement from management to do that and recognized that doing it took a lot of time, but thought that it was an important thing. The only proviso that he had ever put on it was that he would like to have anything that dealt with scientific material run past them, so that at least that aspect was accurate. Whatever the media wanted to say past that was up to them. It had worked very well.

He wanted to make one other comment, based on limited experience, relative to something that Al Murray had said about going to the private sector for press coverage. It had been his experience, certainly within his own department, that the information services had really been quite poor. His group had large outputs in all media forms, but he could not think of one off-hand that got out because of any of their own services. Part of the problem was simply that they were not competitive. They did not get paid or hired or fired or whatever by whether or not they produced to the same degree. If they were dealing with the private sector, there was a great deal more motivation to get material out, and if it was good and it was accurate, then obviously people were going to come back to them. He thought that was the way to go.

J.A. Keith, summing up, said that they had heard from very skilled communicators. The three case studies had been pungently described, and their task would be to learn from them how better to manage the next public controversies that they would have to face. They now knew that wildlife controversies did not just arouse public opinion, but might also raise public doubts about the abilities of wildlife managers to manage, and about whether wildlife management was even desirable. They must learn quickly and well how to be effective communicators. Don Dodds, David Quinton, Tom Crowther, and Al Murray had given them much to think about, and were owed their warmest thanks.

Techniques of communication (1)

INTRODUCTION OF SPEAKER

A.J. Macaulay
Ducks Unlimited (DU) Canada

Dr. Sandy Macaulay briefly introduced Carl Radimer, as speaker on communication techniques, mentioning his experience as an editor, and his stint as an instructor in public relations and journalism at the Southern Alberta Institute of Technology. He continued:

From there, Mr. Radimer went to DU Canada as that organization's public relations manager for a period of time, where he had the great and difficult task of trying to straighten out a bunch of biologists, and he formed some very distinct impressions of the profession during that time period. Carl, in his time with DU Canada, was largely responsible for the development of the agricultural extension program entitled "The health of the land".

At the present time, Carl is Managing Editor of the grass-roots program for Informart, basically a service to North American farmers that makes up-to-the-minute computer-processed information available to, say, a southern Alberta rancher's home or a cantaloupe grower in California. This is information on weather, market forecasts, and generally any information that will be important to a farm producer's operation. Carl is accredited by the Canadian Public Relations Society. He describes himself as a dispassionate observer of controversy, and also as a specialist in survival.

Carl will endeavour to give us the principles of public relations that hopefully will keep us out of most of the hot water. He intends to finish up with some discussion of a couple of specialist forms of media--the application of television, for example, to reach large numbers of people--and then he is going to deal with what do we do when we get into a fire-fighting situation if we have not been able to prevent it. I think that should form the basis for probably some of our discussion. I am sure most of you have been into one of those nasty situations similar to the ones that were described earlier in the session. Everybody's question is: How do we get out of them; how can we "smear some PR on it" to save our hides?

Techniques of communication (2)

EFFECTIVE PUBLIC RELATIONS

C. Radimer
Managing editor
Informart

I am really relieved that in that long and very generous introduction Sandy Macaulay avoided the word "expert". I have heard the latest definition of this particularly prolific species as being one who knows so much about so little, he can stop thinking. I can assure you that in the last couple days of listening to your deliberations and information I certainly have not had any opportunity to stop thinking. In fact, I have been so challenged by the messages and observations that I have gotten from you people, that I have to keep running out and rewriting notes. Certain issues that I assumed would be overlooked in this group were, in fact, addressed very eloquently.

So, just as I can assure you that your deliberations have given me much to think about, it seems my task then is to simply provide a primer on the "how-to" of public relations (PR).

What do we do next? I hope that you will bear with me if I expand a little bit on that and take a broader view of assessing, first of all, the suitability of the various messages you want to disseminate to the public. How well will they fit various media? Will they work? Will they meet the objectives that you set forward?

If we could, in this room, bring in 24 million or so Canadians, I am sure that we would certainly influence national public opinion towards wildlife conservation topics. The problem is that probably 23 999 900 would have other priorities. They just could not make it to Halifax in this particular week and, as a result, they would live for ever in ignorance of all of the information that is available to influence their opinion. That is, unless we could do something to get it out to them.

In the jargon of the public relations profession, we have a powerful collective message here in search of a medium or group of media that can deliver it to various publics to convince them of the need to improve our wildlife conservation efforts.

This, of course, is the essence of a public relations campaign--the dissemination of private messages. It is the art of communicating a self-interest in terms that meet the audience's self-interest. Unfortunately, like the cobbler's children who have holes in their shoes, public relations people often suffer that same indistinct image problem that they purport to solve for their clients. I hope that, by the end of this presentation, you may have a little better understanding of what a public relations campaign is, what a public relations practitioner can do, and an understanding of the basic techniques that you can employ in your own communication assignments.

Defining PR

There are many definitions of the PR business ranging from the uncomplimentary--I have heard it described as the world's second oldest profession--to some that are beautifully complex and vague; the sort that you can hide behind when somebody asks you specifically what you do for a living. My personal favourite definition is that a public relations man is a journalist who writes about airplanes that land safely. I think that succinctly sums up a public relations role as an interpreter and communicator of private messages that enhance rather than detract from an organization's public image.

A more formal definition describes the art as "the planned effort to influence public opinion through responsible action based on two-way communication". I think this is a particularly appropriate definition in that it does a number of things:

(1) It recognizes public relations as an activity rather than a commodity that is delivered off the back of the truck and spread around to quell public displeasure whenever some corporate decision-maker jumps up and says, "Get some PR out there right away". Public relations is a planned effort to influence opinion. It does not just happen. Somebody has got to stop and consider, and this leads us into all sorts of interesting things.

(2) It recognizes that public relations must conform to the public's perception of what is "fair". "Fair" is a very tricky word; I am told by some linguists that only English really uses it as a concept, other languages have something close but not quite "fair". "Fair" is sort of in the eye of the beholder, I suppose. So what we have to do, in our influencing of public opinion, is use something that the public considers is "fair". In short, while a bribe may be far more efficient as an influence on public opinion in certain societies (ours being among them), we cannot use it. I am told by practitioners at international symposia on public relations that this is not a universal taboo, that a little baksheesh will sometimes move the wheels of public opinion.

(3) It identifies the need for a dialogue in the communication process. What we are trying to do is influence opinion, not educate. There is a tendency in corporate and institutional circles to describe the job of communicating as "educating the public", as if the public is stupid, uneducated, or ignorant.

The public is, in fact, remarkably astute. We are probably dealing today with a better educated, more astute, better informed, better served by the communication media, public than ever before. So the idea of educating to me seems a little demeaning. I prefer to retain the idea of a dialogue where the "give-and-take" leads to a consensus. Influence public opinion through responsible action based on this two-way communication; not by talking at, but talking with, people.

(4) Finally, the definition elevates the process above the handing out of key-chains and baseball hats, something that everybody loves to do and something tangible to give. It recognizes the need for public relations implications to be considered right from the outset of policy formulation. Too often, public relations is simply regarded as remedial action to be taken whenever that which is run up the flagpole gets torn down and burned rather than saluted.

So, with those definitions in mind and keeping a very clear mind--we are influencing opinion, not buying favours, not giving a snow job--let us take a look at a few steps to get a PR campaign going.

Planning the campaign

To even mention defining the objectives as the starting point in developing a PR campaign might seem too obvious. But before you start anything, do you not define the objectives? Unless the campaign clearly defines what the objective is, it is doomed to fail.

For example, let us consider a public relations campaign in its simplest form: a campaign to encourage support for a community centre. To have a successful campaign, you are going to have to start right from square-one and cite what you want the public to do. What is the response you require from this?

- Do you want them to throw money at you so that you can build it?

- Do you want them to sign a petition to change zoning allowances?

You have to be quite specific. Unless you do that, you are going to find yourselves spinning your wheels, running around, and wondering why it is not working. Unless you determine where you want to be, you will never know when you get there.

In the real world, the need for a PR campaign usually manifests itself very late in the communication process. I think we had an example of that here with the British Columbia wolf situation. Usually it comes up when some "investigative journalist" (I hate that term; it is a grammatical redundancy if there ever was one) rediscovers the fundamental truth that in a system where the majority rules, the minority often is compromised. In the BC situation, the decisions were made and the damage done before PR reaction was considered.

I am not naive enough to suggest that public relations practitioners can always anticipate public reaction to all events. I do contend that if public reactions were considered at an early stage in the development of policy and action, much of the back-pedalling, controversy, and media-baiting that accompany so many corporate and interest-group activities could readily be avoided.

The auto industry, for example, learned this lesson well. Those of us who daily entrust our lives and limbs to an automobile that is built on cost-cutting principles owe a lot to a slight young fellow in Washington with a bad-fitting suit by the name of Ralph Nader. He is perhaps the father of advocacy interest groups. Those of us who drive a car owe a vote of thanks to Mr. Nader for some of the improvements in safety that he was able to bring about in the industry. And those of us who work in the public relations profession owe him a great deal, because he did an awful lot to make public relations a more high-profile profession than it was in the pre-Nader days.

Nader recognized a social problem. He assembled facts and figures that substantiated his viewpoint; in fact, only those facts and figures, if you come right down to it, that substantiated his viewpoint. Mr. Nader was never a "however" man. If the fact, if the statistic, if the figure substantiated what he wanted to impress upon the public to influence their opinion, he used it. If

the other side wanted to come back with a rebuttal, that was their business. He then communicated so powerfully that he marshalled a wave of public opinion that changed the face of an industry that once boasted: "What's good for General Motors is good for the USA". And even if that phrase was never actually uttered, Nader was so effective that you are prepared to believe that it should have been. That was an indication, I think, of the first of the powerful advocacy campaigns now taken for granted. Nader went on to develop a whole new consumer advocacy industry. But none of the subsequent campaigns, in my estimation anyhow, had the same power as that confrontation with the corporate mastodons who headed the auto industry in the 1960s. He struck at an industry that affected us all. And when he built his campaign on a David-vs-Goliath battle, he had a theme that mass media simply could not ignore.

PR and sealing

David Quinton earlier provided us with some interesting historical data on the seal hunt that were to this wildlife non-professional, at least, new. I must confess I was not aware that this issue had been going on for more than 20 years. As I listened to him relate the history of the confrontation, I had to wonder what would have happened if someone in the seal industry had taken a look down the road 20 years ago and had seen that television--international television in fact--would become a very important mass medium. If that same person, looking into a crystal ball, could have determined that any industry that depended on cracking cherubic seal pups over the head with a club was about to fall on tough times relating to a public two generations away from the reality of the farm, the hog-scalding pot, the chopping-block behind the hen-house, and the abattoir at the end of town where father drove the cow in the morning and came back with a side of beef in the afternoon.

Perhaps things could have been different. Public relations 20 years ago, as Mr. Quinton mentioned, was a new art form, a new science, or a new discipline. It played second cousin to scientific action in the communication process. As a result, the pro-sealing viewpoint was confined to mere words, which were ineffectively used to try to counter very vivid images.

The arguments for the sealing industry, as I recall them, were strictly words--words about the economic impact and financial well-being of fishermen. There were words about the efficiency of clubbing as compared to other methods of dispatching seals; words about tradition, about biological over-population, about damage to fishing equipment. In short, there were words about issues far removed from the concerns, priorities, and emotions of those whose influence was being increasingly heeded by politicians.

I am probably treading on some sensitive toes even by alluding to this issue. But I think that it serves as an example of an issue with two legitimate viewpoints, both of which are substantiated with solid data and information. A public relations practitioner can make a strong case for either viewpoint. But, unfortunately for the sealing industry, their opponents had a better handle on public opinion and the techniques involved in shifting neutral opinion. In the end, those emotion-wrenching film clips were judged more credible and more acceptable than all the words of the industry's spokesmen.

It is a sobering thought for those of us in the public relations industry that emotional arguments are very difficult to counter. In the discussion following this, I would appreciate some input from you. Emotion: How do you fight it? How do you create it? Is it a responsible basis for a PR program?

Take the sealing industry and contrast it with the issues confronting the meat-packing industry from animal rights activists. Meat-packers are taking a little heat, there is no question. But as far as we can tell, meat-packing is far from a dead industry. Packers have long recognized their dependence on strong public support. They invested many millions of dollars and many hundreds of thousands of hours in nurturing public support through advertising, through communicating the industry's role as an employer, as a purveyor of a product that many people consume. You can even arrange a tour of an abattoir, if you so desire, although I am told by some of my colleagues within meat-packing industry communication departments that very few people ask for these. But if you think there is something nasty going on behind the closed doors, you are welcome to see for yourself. It gives the packing industry the image of being open, forthright, and straight-up.

This is good-will that the industry can call upon when the wind switches, "eau d'abattoir" wafts across suburbia and people gag a little bit, or some fringe group decides that vegetarianism is the only "morally equitable" behaviour for a modern man.

Learning lessons

Several speakers here have alluded to the lessons learned from the seal hunt, but I am concerned that perhaps these have not been learned well enough when I hear of the British Columbia government's attempts to communicate the rationale of their wolf strategy. I also was somewhat concerned by the fur industry's reliance on an educational program for humane trapping as one of the cornerstones of their public relations campaign.

I am also concerned when I hear of policy-makers who feel that they can work independently of the real world as long as they have, somewhere in the organization, a PR person who will take the arrows and shoot them as they are passed down from upstairs.

Sandy Macaulay mentioned my association with the Ducks Unlimited "Health of the land" program. This idea of defining a specialized interest in terms compatible with a larger interest group was the cornerstone of DU Canada's campaign. It was an effort to influence farm opinion in favour of the DU marshland conservation program.

From most farmers' perspectives, the whole idea of worrying about conserving a commodity that robs farmers of their profits through depredation, that takes up a lot of potential and drainable cropland, and that annually attracts a fair number of individuals who do not quite understand proper etiquette concerning private land, like closing gates, getting rid of beer bottles, things like that, can be somewhat obscure.

Few farmers greet the 39th day of a drought with the observation that the lack of water certainly puts pressure on North America's waterfowl resource. I have

seldom heard this in the farmyards. Thus, an organization appealing for their support to preserve waterfowl is unlikely to be overwhelmingly accepted and considered. Yet the objective of the "Health of the land" campaign was exactly that. It was to get western Canadian farmers to undertake dialogue with DU to achieve certain objectives. The campaign was developed around the basic theme that agriculture and wildlife share a common concern, and that concern is water. Ducks need water; agriculture needs water; it is as clear as that.

To the farmer, the abundance of water means a good crop; to DU, abundance of water means a good duck crop; it is the same thing. Therefore, the theme was developed of "Working together for the health of the land". The concept was not universally accepted. I recall that the first advertisement we tried was a picture of a calf and a duck. It said, "They both depend on the same thing for the health of the land". Within a day or two of the advertisement being published, a tear-sheet came flying back and somebody had scribbled with a felt pen over the duck, "Yah, but this SOB eats my grain!" Somewhere along the line we still had an adversary but, by-and-large, that was the first step in a program to try to relate with farmers.

It was expanded from there to talk about other farm issues from a farm, rather than a wildlife, perspective. We talked about burning stubble as a program detrimental to the health of the land from a farming perspective. Mention was made well into the message of its detrimental effects on cover and on nesting waterfowl. But the main issue was that when you set fire to your land you lost nitrogen. We had some figures researched to back this up to indicate how much nitrogen was lost through the burning of the stubble.

We also talked about salinity, how the draining of sloughs did not necessarily make sense--the result was often a saline seep where no crop grew and the area was lost both for agriculture and wildlife. Farmers in many areas appreciated that particular fact. They saw it every day; they were aware of it. They just never looked at it from that particular perspective.

We talked, too, about zero-till and winter wheat and depredation quite candidly, mentioning, as DU appreciated, that there was a depredation problem. The result was not a flood of queries from farmers demanding that we install projects on their property. That was not an objective of the campaign and it did not come to pass. What we were trying to do was to convince farmers that the organization understood them, appreciated their concerns, recognized their role in land-use planning, and had a few ideas from an agricultural perspective that they might want to consider because that was in their own interest.

Feature film and TV spots

I think that in the end the program did correct some misconceptions. It acknowledged the need for co-operation and it extended an invitation to requests for more information. As an ice-breaker it seemed to work, and when we took the "Health of the land" program and developed it into a 27-minute feature film, we had a very encouraging number of requests from right across the prairies--from agricultural schools, from extension agents--to use this film as part of their ag-extension programs. I know some DU directors were a little concerned about this film when we premiered it for them. The premiere, incidentally, was shown to a group of agricultural journalists (I think that was the first time that

ag-journalists as a group had been invited to a DU presentation). They wondered why they were invited and, when they called, we would say, "Come on out and find out".

We had a good turn-out, but one director pointed out that DU was not mentioned until the 20th minute of the 27-minute film. He wondered what sort of public relations program we were running with this kind of down-playing. In the end, though, the idea was to encourage farmers to view the organization from a different perspective.

Similarly, I do not know of too many Canadians who get up in the morning and greet the dawn of a new day with a resolution that today is the day that they are going to do something for the ducks. Most greet the new day with "Good God, it's raining again", or "a mortgage payment is due", and so forth. So conservation concerns are pretty low on their list of concerns and priorities.

Yet, for a wildlife organization, broad public exposure is really essential in this day and age, when so many decisions are made by politicians who respond to the interest of their constituents. The idea of taking an organization with an interest as specialized as DU Canada to reach a broad audience was quite a challenge.

The approach we took (and I hope this is being used in your areas) was an animated cartoon, 30-second, public service advertising television spot. We developed a character, "DU Duck", a high-quality animated cartoon, who did silly things. He did not do wise biologically sound things. The corporate PR objective of that particular program was to reach a broader audience, to introduce a growing contributor program, develop a higher profile with elected government officials, and underline the international, non-political nature of the organization. There were really three sub-objectives in there.

The commercials were very well received by media and the public. The DU Executive Vice-President, Stew Morrison, told me just before he left for New Zealand that he bumped into a stranger in a Whitehorse, Yukon Territory, public house, who responded with the "Two ducks for every home--no, two homes for every duck" line central to one of these particular commercials, when Stew told him that he was associated with Ducks Unlimited. In the Yukon, obviously, the local station was using the commercials. When the person heard "DU Canada", he formed an image of the company, hopefully a positive image.

By the same token, these same spots have been criticized by some within the conservation community as being too cute, a perpetuation of the "Disney syndrome". They have also been criticized as biological simplifications; a little bit demeaning to the organization and its principles and principals. As a member of the creative team involved in the "DU Duck" project, I have to agree with the critics. The spots were cute. That is what prompts broadcast managers to schedule them free of charge on their stations, thus giving the organization the equivalent of tens of thousands of dollars of free exposure.

They are also simplifications of complex biological phenomena. The response to the question, "Why do waterfowl fly south each fall?", is flippantly answered with a "Why not?". Possibly not too informative, but the idea of condensing Frank Bellrose's definitive waterfowl text into a 30-second TV spot was more of a challenge than our creative team was up to at the time.

They may even portray Ducks Unlimited as a group with a sense of humour; one prepared to smile a bit when meeting new people, a group a lot of different people can feel comfortable with. But that, of course, is the whole idea.

"DU Duck" will probably never sign up a project, bring someone out to a water-licence application hearing in DU's defence, or walk uninvited into a DU dinner and buy a painting. But he has introduced a whole new group of people to an organization doing something for waterfowl and feeling good about themselves for doing it.

Perhaps in that is something that the wildlife community as a whole can learn something from. The people outside, the ones who have their concerns and their mortgages and their car payments, and all these types of things, do not put conservation concerns very high on their list of priorities. It is natural and a reality. I think every one in this room can appreciate that.

Influencing public opinion

Before you can influence public opinion, you have to find out where it stands; something that is often ignored in this world where "ready, fire, aim" is confused with decisive, gutsy management. This is an area where it is wise to seek professional opinion polling. Much of the conventional knowledge that drifts within organizations dedicated to narrow interests is highly coloured by tradition, isolation, and simple inbreeding. Beware of generalizations like: "They're all against us", etc.

It is much safer to check this kind of information out and determine that 37% of farmers over the age of 70 located within 10 miles of a provincial park disapproved of your plans. It is also wise to avoid the media as indicators of public opinion. Good news seldom merits front-page treatment. In fact, I am told of a publisher in Colorado who determined to put out a publication that featured only good, positive news. It seems he lasted just 6 months only because it took him 5 months to present the story of his bankruptcy in a happy, positive light.

Public opinion

Where does public opinion stand? Well, to ascertain that we will have to ask a few questions. What kind of response do we want from a group? Where does the public stand on the issue? Do you want them to talk, write a letter, whatever? What response should we expect?

There should not be any great surprises in this if you analyze the public out there. Advocacy groups--Greenpeace, Consumers' Association of Canada, General Motors of Canada--it is fairly obvious what their reactions to issues might be. Which groups within the public should you expect to support you; which ones should you expect to oppose you? Make a list. Regardless of your communication aims, the public can be categorized into three broad groups:

> Your allies - Who are your allies? Well, you will find that they are the true believers. They are the people who are so convinced that you, as wildlife advocates, are so pertinent to their interests that they will follow you to the death, and defend you to the death, regardless of what you do. There are people like that around. I do not find them too often, but there are a few about.

Your adversaries - On the other end of the spectrum are your adversaries. These are people so convinced that your objectives as an organization, or as an interest group, represent a dire threat to the continuation of life as we know it that they would not change their opinions if the seas were to part and hosts of heavenly angels were to trumpet your slogan at centre-ice at the Montreal Forum every Saturday night--and in two official languages plus Gaelic for Nova Scotians, I suppose. These are the ones that are against you.

The neutrals - The most important group in the spectrum are the neutrals. They are those people who have not given the whole situation much thought up until now. Their opinion is still in a state of flux. Solid information, a good nice warm feeling, an approach whatever it might be, can shift the matter towards the allies' point-of-view or can push it towards the adversarial point-of-view. The goal of the whole PR program in influencing public opinion is to recognize where the various interest groups stand, and then determine what information, what messages to disseminate to get them to move towards your side before your adversaries can get them moving towards their end of the opinion spectrum.

It is a fact of life that a campaign aimed at either the allies or at the adversaries is not going to do very much to influence opinion. I am not suggesting ignoring your allies, but when a PR campaign is built and most of the investment is put into a message aimed at your supporters--annual reports, for example, that go out only to those who contributed to you, corporate magazines or newsletters that go to your members only--this is really, in PR terms, a waste of time and money. The message of what you are doing and how you are doing it is going to people who should already know this.

On the other hand, to throw a lot of money at your adversaries is, I think, equally futile. It does not matter what you do or what you say. You are not likely to shift the really dogmatic end of this particular spectrum. Thus, the challenge remains to determine where public opinions lie and what causes them to lie there.

How can one determine where public opinion lies on any given issue? A professional, statistically accurate sampling of your audience is the most reliable way, but there are a few guidelines to aid in determining the kind of message to do the job:

(1) People want to do the right thing as they see it. Present your idea as an opportunity to support something "right" in the audience's view.

(2) Present your idea in terms that meet your audience's self (but not necessarily selfish) interests. Something that will not cost, but will give a warm feeling, will be supported. Ideas that call upon people to make sacrifices for the good of some nebulous ideal are seldom accepted. Those who do accept these sacrifices will be likely to switch allegiances when presented with a concept requiring even greater sacrifice.

(3) Avoid the repent-and-be-saved approach. Farmers, we discovered, resent being blamed for a situation. If fingered as the problem and advised to mend their ways, they become defensive; if invited to become part of a bigger solution that offers them some tangible benefits, they are more likely to respond favourably.

(4) Opinions are formed more strongly on events than the words used to describe events. Cite examples of your idea, take people to the scene of the action, ask them to provide the examples that will reinforce your point.

(5) People accept leaders more readily when they feel they will have a part in the decision-making process. Commission surveys, make phone calls, ask questions in a way that will elicit the answers you need.

(6) Recognize that the people you most need to influence are seldom found in meetings called to discuss the issue.

There is one warning here that I put in because I noticed in my time with the wildlife conservation community that there is a great interest in meetings. You hold a meeting, get people together in a schoolhouse and tell them where it's at. It does not work. The people you need most in a meeting--the neutrals--the people who are there to gain information, to get the facts and figures, to evaluate where their self-interest lies, are seldom at public meetings. Public meetings tend to attract two polarized groups. Your allies are on one side cheering; your adversaries are on the other side cheering. God help any neutral who happens to walk into the middle of this dog-and-cat fight.

Having determined where public interest lies, let us look at how we can shift it a little. We need facts, we need figures, we need a message. This is where I am going to get into the "Popular mechanics" approach, sort of "Basic PR 105" point-by-point.

Writing the message

Unless what you are trying to communicate is down on a piece of paper and agreed to, you are going to have no end of problems. Everyone will have a different interpretation, and when the feed-back comes back into the organization, there is chaos. I would very strongly suggest that this is an area where you should hire professional writers. Much of the misquoting blamed on media is, in fact, the result of unclear communication on the part of the group attempting to communicate. Language can be extremely precise. Unfortunately, it is seldom used that way. Newspaper people, publishers, and broadcasters work with the language day-in and day-out--they communicate! Many people in specialized fields do not have that same experience and versatility--they verbalize.

Here are a few generalizations on more effective writing. I certainly cannot cover it in the few minutes I have, but a few comments may cover the main points.

(1) Avoid generalizations. You get nothing but trouble by starting off with "Generally speaking...". If it is obvious, why say it?

(2) Use direct quotes from acknowledged and accessible specialists, so that your audience has the option of checking your facts if they wish to. Use experts, not public relations or communications people. I do not consider myself a professional biologist nor a professional wildlife manager. My role in the whole process is to be the communicator. I will tell you what has to be said; you tell me what you want to say and I will develop some ways to say it.

Something that is issued as a message saying, "The Public Relations Director of Apex Conservation Company announced today..." lacks credibility. The fact that it is attributed to public relations has the implication that this is not quite on the up-and-up. If it is coming from an Executive Director, the Vice-president of Finance on those matters, or the Chief Biologist, the message is better accepted. And if the person is identified, the audience has the opportunity to say, "Well, I may not agree with it but I'll check it out later".

(3) Forget everything you ever learned in university on "Report writing 101" or whatever you took. Use direct verbs and active voice when you are trying to communicate outside your own profession. "In order that" is a great one: we did this "in order that". The word you are looking for is "so". The other beauty is "multi-million". To a newsman that is just a flag--how many multis--and it turns out to be 1.2 million. If it is an important fact, substantiate it, quantify it, and go with it. If you do not want to announce it, then do not say anything about it at all.

"It has been observed that", is one of my favourites. "It has been observed that" means "is". "No firm evidence to support" is the opposite, or "isn't". The extra words may sound great, but to communicate clearly, nice, short, Anglo-Saxon words that are precise and well-defined will get your message across much better.

(4) Cite only evidence that reinforces your objectives in communicating. Avoid "however". "However" really has no place in a public relations lexicon. Sure, there may be another side to the story, but it usually is another interest group's responsibility to put it across.

(5) Be aware of possible counter-arguments, but do not undermine your own case by confusing back-pedalling with fair comments. Words like "although", "despite", "on the other hand" can weaken your position. They should be used with great care when attempting to communicate a position to a large audience.

(6) Acknowledge the opposing view only if you can present strong, irrefutable evidence to challenge it. People may say, "Well, there is another side to the issue". True, but we are in the business of public relations communication, not journalism. A public relations message is not an impartial discourse. It is a vehicle to communicate a viewpoint to influence the audience's opinion.

(7) Above all, make sure of your facts. When you are in doubt, edit out. Be prepared to accept that the opposing view may have some merit. In fact, they may even have a few stronger facts, a few stronger statistics. You are dealing today, as I mentioned, with a better educated, better informed audience than ever before. The public is aware of its rights, it is critical of others' responsibilities and is well served by the media.

Although I may jibe at my friends in the journalism profession, they are brighter, better educated, more ambitious than they ever were in the newsrooms of my youth. Besides that, they are paid well enough to go for the facts instead of going for the free lunch. Your facts must be correct. I noticed a comment here that bothered me as a public relations person. Somebody said, "You know, for PR purposes, we will do this." That is an unfortunate phrase. For PR purposes, you should play it even straighter than you

would for internal uses. The media simply will not buy a snow job; they are paid enough to be selective and they are smart enough to recognize one when they see it.

Understanding media

Having developed a message, the next thing is to find a way to get the thing out. This is where we get into "understanding media"; a catchy sub-heading that would serve as a good book title. Having identified the audience, determined what information might initiate a favourable shift of opinion within the neutrals, and polished our prose, we can consider ways to get this message out of this room and to those 300 million North Americans who should be sharing our concerns for wildlife conservation without the expense of buying a half-hour spot on the "Rose Bowl Parade" coverage.

"Media", of course, is one of those delightful "buzz" words that allow laymen to assume that the experts are worth the fees they charge. Reduced to their common denominator, media simply are the carriers of information within the communication chain.

In terms of public relations campaigns there are two types of media--mass and selective. Mass media are those media that reach large audiences, public media. They are universal, in many respects. They include press, magazines, radio, television, films, and things like that; these are all mass media. They are relatively indiscriminate in who they reach. Anybody at any time may be part of that communication process.

Selective media are those that include specific, special interest magazines, corporate publications, newsletters, closed-circuit television, and direct mail--in other words, those media that cater to, or are directed at, specific, demographically defined groups. For our purposes, mass media have certain definite advantages.

Advantages of mass media

(1) As mentioned, you reach large numbers with a single exposure.

(2) Your message can acquire additional legitimacy by reason of the fact it appeared in a legitimate publication or electronic medium. Information on this particular group that appears tomorrow morning in the "Globe and Mail" acquires some of the legitimacy of "Canada's national newspaper". If it appears in the Halifax paper, it acquires the legitimacy of being a local thing. People look at it and say, "Oh, it must be right, I saw it in the paper." I think this attitude may be changing somewhat.

(3) You may receive additional media attention and follow-up exposure. If you tell a newsman, "I've got this particular story" and hand him a press release, he may come and do a feature. He may bring in a photographer, a camera crew, and the next thing you know you may be in Hollywood.

(4) You will be impressed and so will your boss be to see your organization's name in the "Globe and Mail" or the "Wall Street Journal". The mass media have definite advantages.

On the down-side

(1) Because mass media are so convenient for one message to reach all of these people, editors and broadcasters are flooded with requests from private organizations to communicate their messages.

Roger Simmons has talked to us of measuring his mail by the foot. When I was involved with the "Country Guide" magazine, which is Canada's largest farm magazine, we measured our press releases by the bag. Very few of those releases ever saw the light of day. If we had a new reporter in, or somebody had overspent their expense account, they might be put to work sorting the releases, but 99% of the material was discarded out of hand.

Many media simply reject all such requests. Others are extremely selective. Editors learn that a particular envelope often contains something they can use, and they may take a look on Wednesday afternoon if things are slow. Then there are a few editors, of course, who print anything that comes in cheap. I am sure you have got these papers stuffed between the doors at home. They are good for the Post Office, but as credible media to carry your messages they are usually very low on the list.

(2) Another real risk is that press-release offerings may be rejected, altered, or what is really frightening, combined with other material at the editor's discretion, then published.

(3) In many cases a news release issued to promote a certain cause arrives late. Or it may appear months later, generating a flood of requests for an event lost, gone, and forgotten. You lose control over your message when you rely on mass media.

(4) Your message can be scheduled for off-hours on broadcast media or relegated to back pages, and thus lose effectiveness. Media are under no obligation whatsoever to carry your message. The information, what they run and what they reject, is selected strictly on the editor's opinion of what is in the readers' or the audiences' interest.

Media with a careful eye on the balance sheet have occasionally been known to apply other criteria: Will it offend advertisers? Will it offend the medium's management? The comment was made here that it is the duty of the free press to inform. My feeling, after working on both sides of the information chain, is that it is the duty of the public library system to inform. It is the duty of media to maintain a viable circulation base. The editor who does not fulfil his readers' or his listeners' expectations of what they are prepared to pay for is one who is soon unemployed.

Since the idea here is to maximize your chances of appealing and making it through that first cut, let us look at some alternative media.

Special interest publications

These are those nice predictable magazines--you know where they are going, you know who gets them, you know that a piece of information, a story, a news item directed to that very defined, very selective audience has a very good chance of getting into those particular publications--the trade magazines and the professional journals.

The down-side of those, of course, is that you are preaching to a converted audience. However, there are opportunities to take a story on wildlife conservation and put it, with a certain slant, into a magazine catering to a slightly different interest. By shifting the emphasis of the story, you have a good opportunity of communicating your objective to a specific audience.

Association newsletters and so forth, are excellent too. They are very receptive to well done, timely information. One medium I particularly want to mention is direct mail. Everybody has a post-office box or a mail box. There are lists of opinion leaders; lists of people categorized by interests. It is often an excellent investment to buy a list, publish a newsletter, write a letter, print a flyer, and mail it as first-class mail. That costs 34¢ a throw nowadays, but it is hitting a very defined audience very powerfully. Few people can throw away first-class mail without at least looking at it.

How to handle print

I am assuming here that, regardless of what I said about mass media, you still have this awful urge to see your material in the "Globe and Mail" or "Financial Post" or one of the magazines. Let us take a look at a few ways in which we might be able to maximize our chances of at least having an editor look at it.

(1) Familiarize yourself with the publication. Recognize what sort of readers it reaches. You can get a feel by reading the magazine. What kind of words are used? What are the issues and so forth?

Try to determine what the editor's hang-ups and bandwagons are. What is the editor big on, and down on? No matter how well presented your piece of information, if it goes contrary to editorial policy or opinion, it does not stand much of a chance of publication.

(2) You also have to realize that your words, the ones that you so arduously penned and polished will not necessarily find their way verbatim to the printed page. So choose your words carefully, not for the literary merit, but to make sure they are clear enough that even if the editor decides to grab a synonym, the message will still make some sense.

(3) Recognize that, even if the editor looks at your material, you have only the first paragraph--or 27 words according to the Carleton Journalism School formula for writing leads--to catch the editor's interest. Do not waste time on names, titles, and other ego-boosting stuff. Get the who, when, where, what, and how out of the way, and let the editor know why his or her readers, listeners, or viewers should be interested in more of what you have to say.

(4) Push the local angle when approaching local media. Mention local people. A story about Nova Scotia wildlife habitat achievements is of very little interest in New Brunswick. It can be of extreme interest to a weekly newspaper editor or to a magazine editor if it is a local person. With modern word-processors, it is very easy to write a blanket story and have a paragraph that changes for each medium. What you do in that case is identify the local person for each editor and insert the particular paragraph, print them off, and make sure that the mailing is correct. The editor can then

look at the item as a local piece. An announcement of a 100-acre development in a particular town is likely to get more exposure in that town than an announcement of a million-acre national program somewhere else.

(5) Use pictures to replace the proverbial thousand words. A good black-and-white photograph, 5 x 7 or bigger, is an excellent piece of bait to catch an editor. Black-and-white photographs, especially if they are in focus and have good contrast, are better than those most weekly newspaper editors can acquire themselves. They will use them or, at least, they will look at what you have to say in the accompanying release.

(6) Use a specific anecdote or example to reinforce a general statement. Make the general statement and reinforce it.

(7) Use couriers or personal delivery to ensure that the item gets as close to the decision-maker as possible. Follow up on critical messages. If you deliver it in person, the editor is more apt to get it.

(8) Always identify a contact person who is real and is at the end of a telephone line, so that you can respond with more information if requested.

(9) Do not go to the well too often.

(10) Keep your media lists up-to-date. Dead editors tell no tales, either.

(11) Offer exclusives; offer to collaborate; work with the media's people.

How to handle television

Television is by far the most powerful medium available to us today. It is also the most technically demanding. It is a medium in which there is fantastic competition for the number of broadcasting hours that are available, particularly those that are available at peak times. Television is a medium that the public relations profession has not really come to grips with too clearly yet.

One of the problems is that with television the words are very much secondary to the images. When we think of communication we think of press releases, we think of position papers, rather than thinking in terms of images that are, of course, the core of effective television presentation.

Much of the television that is produced by public agencies and corporations falls into the "talking heads" type of presentation, in which a script is written and a head is put onto the screen dead-centre to talk. It is not very dynamic television. In fact, unless the announcer, the person talking, is extremely attractive, extremely ugly, cross-eyed, or equally unique, there is really no visual tie-in.

A successful television campaign requires thinking in terms of action, in terms of images, in terms of pictures, colours, and all of those things that contribute to making a dynamic image on the screen, to capture attention first and to communicate information second.

Tight, terse scripts are what the news directors on television tell me are extremely necessary if you are going to have a hope of getting your particular interest put in the news segments of their broadcasting. Editors simply do not have the time, the interest, or the manpower to edit, extract, and rewrite scripts for anything other than those very controversial issues.

Clips and films

The 30-second clips, written with a stop watch in hand, often find some degree of acceptance on local television and occasionally on the national networks, if you can get your material into the national newsrooms quickly enough; 60 seconds is also acceptable, but only if the topic merits that kind of coverage. Supplying some sort of background visual information with your script--scenics of your projects, footage or tape of wildlife in attractive surroundings, pictures of the people mentioned on film, or 35-mm back-up slides--can helpattract interest. When going for television, the secret is in the visual image side.

The other television opportunity, of course, is on the feature side. This again is very complex and a very expensive undertaking. To manufacture a quality 27-minute feature film is a massive undertaking and costs in the $60-125 000 range to do it properly. Few public relation budgets have the kind of money available to be able to do this on a regular basis. However, there are opportunities to use existing feature film or video material for television, provided that it meets a few basic criteria.

This is not my particular area of expertise, but something I have found is that the clock in the television station is absolutely rigid. They also have certain requirements such as station breaks and things like that, so the 27-minute length, while a good rule of thumb, is not final. It is useful to identify, in a covering letter, areas in particular features that can be trimmed to fit the station's requirements.

One thing that certainly increases your opportunity to use public relations film is Canadian Association of Broadcasters certification. The CAB has a program in which they will provide a certificate, attesting that this film was produced in Canada and so on and so forth. Likewise, the CRTC will issue a certificate of Canadian content. Television stations like to have a few items on the rack that they can use in non-peak hours to bring their broadcasting schedule up to meet CRTC requirements. I have offered a number of films to major TV stations on that basis, and the combination of Canadian content, a good film, and an acceptable objective usually means they will use it.

The question of whether to use 16-mm film or 3/4-VHS is a techical one. When I asked around in preparing this part of the presentation, station managers indicated that it did not matter. Major stations can handle either type of equipment.

Your conference chairman asked me to also discuss cable television opportunities. In our particular area of Manitoba, cable TV is not a major medium for audience-reach. However, I know that in other parts of Canada cable companies, in fact, do an excellent local community communication job. Many operators are most amenable to quality material to fill out their broadcasting schedules.

Another possibility if you have a good solid story is to contact the newsroom or the features department of the TV station, explain what you have in mind, and see if they are prepared to work with you in putting together the material. This is probably the most economical way. And, if it is a solid story, you should get a positive response.

Public service

I mentioned earlier the public service advertising (PSA) spots that DU Canada produced and distributed. This was quite an interesting undertaking. Our first feed-back from the TV stations when we inquired as to the possibility of using the material was "not much chance. We're flooded with them, we get thousands of these things".

We pig-headedly crashed ahead anyhow to determine if a very professional, very high quality set of spots would be more acceptable to the stations. It soon became apparent when we distributed these to all Canadian licensed television stations and most cable stations (it is a large distribution list) that we were getting a very encouraging coverage. On checking into the reasons why, one program director admitted that he was getting calls from people who would see this 30-second spot come up out of the corner of their eye and ask when the thing would be scheduled again.

I probably should keep it a deep, dark secret, but very high quality, very well done public service advertising does work. It can get you a great deal of exposure if you qualify as a non-profit, charitable organization. Many stations use PSA material to enhance their image in their community relations programs and it is a good way to use the medium.

Another media opportunity is radio, often a forgotten medium. When the communications industry thinks of radio, if often thinks of US radio, which in too many cases is simply background to other activities. In Canada we have excellent radio opportunities for public relations messages, but to capitalize on them you have to produce your message in a way that is compatible with the medium. Radio is sound; radio is words, well spoken, dramatically presented. A press release is not going to wash. If you can back up your material with tapes, with clips of interviews, on-the-spot sound, your item will have a far better opportunity to get that media exposure.

In general, the closer your message comes to the medium's format, expectations and standards, the better chance you have of using that particular mass medium to get your message across.

Dealing with trouble

Sandy Macaulay mentioned that I would discuss a few pointers on what to do when you are in trouble. I do not have notes, but can refer to an experience that some of you in the wildlife conservation industry probably recall: DU's problems in the Saskeram area of northern Manitoba.

Essentially, the situation was that a wildlife management area (WMA) was coveted by a group of farmers who saw that by developing a WMA on the other side of

Saskatchewan River, there would be great opportunities to take off a crop of barley or hay. This set the stage for a very bitter and long campaign by the farmers to convince government to compromise the WMA and open it for agricultural use.

In western Canada there is nothing holier than farming. It is the highest of all possible callings. To the public in western Canada, usually just one or at most two generations removed from the soil, the objective of taking a crop off is motherhood. Start fighting with farmers, as even the mighty CPR can tell you, and you fight with a really tough adversary. The problem that confronted DU was to maintain its interest in the preservation of marshland habitat without getting a massive backlash of public opinion from the farming community. It was delicate and we learned that you do not fight your private battles in public media.

The media loved the Saskeram controversy. Here we have (I am going to be somewhat subjective in this) a band of farmers eking out a living on the fringes of northern civilization, taking on this huge monolithic American-financed, etc., etc., conservation organization. And everybody knew, of course, that DU is just a lobby for US duck hunters--at least that is what the farmers said, and every word they uttered was picked up and relayed to the southern audience.

In many instances the statements were not only "unfair" but inaccurate. Whether they were true or not is immaterial, since by responding we merely fanned the fires of controversy. We soon discovered that we could not fight our battles by public media with charge and counter-charge back and forth. All we were doing was creating a media circus.

Traditional PR

The approach had to be a more rational, more private, and more planned. The plan followed a traditional public relations format:

(1) We researched to determine where public opinion really stood on the issue.

By going into the community at The Pas, the centre of this whole controversy, asking questions, and trying to get a feel for what, in fact, was the issue, we discovered that the community by-and-large did not agree with the farmers' position. Many opinion leaders in the community--bearing in mind that that community was, in fact, a resource-based community with a long history of trapping--thought those farmers were generally acting irresponsibly. The community feed-back indicated opinions that there was plenty of land out there; it was not being utilized properly, etc.

Realizing that, we were able to develop the campaign. Research showed that we did not have to move public opinion in that community too far. We explained our plans, defined our motive, and identified our common self-interests to shift local community opinion towards the DU proposal.

To make a very long and painful story short, the technique we used was research to determine where public opinion stood each step of the way. We communicated with each of the publics--the native community, the farmers, the natural resources people, the government, and the politicians to determine where each stood and what message could shift opinion positively.

(2) We had to analyze each PR strategy and consider its implications.

Statistics and information had to be assembled to determine the up-side and the down-side of each alternative. What would it cost to drain the area? How would this be paid for? We hired agricultural consultants to check the quality of hay, so that there was an independent assessment on it, since nobody would take DU's word for it. We had these data available for the press when they came in to stir up the pots. We said, "Here is the feed analysis from this hay." So, all of this analysis had to be done to assemble the facts we needed to support our pro-wildlife arguments.

(3) We went into the communication stage of the program.

Having assembled the facts and the figures, we produced brochures and wrote the releases, as well as using direct mail, personal contacts, and so forth to give the message to the public.

(4) The final part was the evaluation.

This is on-going, but the campaign's effectiveness can be assessed by considering that the agreement was signed again, quite recently, to wildlife's benefit.

The major lesson here is that, in a public relations controversy, do not expect the media to fight your battle. You have to get the message out yourself using various tools and techniques.

There is something in the PR text books called the "RACE formula" (research, analyze, communicate, evaluate), and it comes out to this:

(1) Research to determine where things stand.

(2) Analyze the information you have, sort out what supports your point-of-view, and file away for future rebuttal what is against it.

(3) Communicate only after you determine what you are going to say and who you are going to say it to.

(4) Evaluate to find out if the strategy worked.

A great many PR campaigns are disbanded before they have achieved their objective, before there is evidence that public opinion has shifted.

What I have just given you is essentially the heart of effective public relations planning.

Techniques of communication (3)

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

Y. Dubé (Quebec Wildlife Branch) thanked Carl Radimer for a very good address, but said that he had not heard anything about the opposite views; for example, one of the speakers saying: "We discovered, after our campaign, that we were wrong". Suppose that what they were saying was not correct--they might make errors. This sometimes happened between departments, where one was fighting for something and another department was fighting for something else on a particular subject. If they finally found out that all-in-all their department was wrong, what did they do when that happened? Did they say publicly that they were wrong and have another campaign, or what?

C. Radimer (Informart) supposed that what was right and what was wrong was very much in the eye of the beholder. Many of the issues that wildlife faced were controversial with respect to agriculture. He said that both sides would have to compromise if the majority were to be satisfied. With a compromise, nobody was really happy. Right or wrong, they had to define what was the public's interest in that case. In the issue he had mentioned, the Saskeram, he could very easily, as a public relations practitioner, have taken the farmers' side of it and made a very ethical, very strong, and possibly successful campaign, because their objectives were within the public interest. The growing of crops in that area was, all things considered, a socially acceptable process. The organization he represented took another view and said the management of wildlife in that area was more socially acceptable and more economically viable and feasible than the other. It would have been a Texas stand-off, and they had had to compromise somewhere along the line. Who was right and who was wrong? It was a difficult one to judge. That was not a clear answer, but maybe it was a public relations answer.

Y. Dubé said the reason that he had mentioned it was that too often they made up their minds before they had all the facts. They should not be too rigid in their policies, but listen to what others had to say. They had those problems in Quebec. For example, they had a new wildlife policy coming and he knew, and the public in general knew, that they were not consulted very much. With PR jobs, did Mr. Radimer suggest that as a department, for example, with the new wildlife policy, they should tell the public that they did not know this or that, and that they had those options, and ask what the opinions of the public were?

C. Radimer agreed that they should have two-way communication. The dialogue to find out where public opinion stood was important. If they ran into problems at that point, it meant a failure in the research part of the process. In other words, their research was faulty, therefore they were in trouble. They could not pull a snow-job on the public nowadays. Somebody would catch them; either the public themselves, the media, or one of the advocacy groups. So it was vital to make sure that there was a dialogue right from the beginning of the process.

A.J. Macaulay (Ducks Unlimited Canada) thought that Carl Radimer had done a good job of putting much of what they had heard in the morning's session and in Tuesday afternoon's session into a framework. They could now look at an issue like sealing, the wolf control program in British Columbia, or probably other examples that they had encountered themselves, and with the "RACE formula" perhaps analyze that situation and say that was where they went wrong. Generally, he thought, they said they went wrong somewhere along the way when they got into one of those shooting incidents. The message he was getting was that public relations could keep them out of those things, but they should do their homework beforehand and try and stay away from those hot issues. On behalf of the group, he extended their sincere appreciation to Carl Radimer for so aptly putting the matter into a framework that hopefully they could all begin to implement.

REPORT ON CONFERENCE FINDINGS

A.J. Macaulay
Ducks Unlimited (DU) Canada

My task is to sum up the findings of this conference and, unlike some of the speakers who have preceded me, I have had no other direction than that.

I cannot recall a meeting of this nature in recent years when, given the challenge of a subject as broad as "Communicating about wildlife", and having had a range of speakers as diverse as we have, the quality of the speakers has been so consistently high, especially in their delivery, and that the message in each case was so thoughtfully developed. I get the sense from the group that those messages were on target. The messages, although they come from very diverse sources, people from within our business and people in other sectors--the communication field, for example--have been extremely consistent and complementary one to the other. I had a feeling in the previous session that the message was so consistent and complementary that it was almost becoming repetitive. I do not mean that in a negative sense at all. So that places me in a pretty awkward position, sort of like a guy who has been given the directions, confronted with a bunch of world-class chefs who have been asked to cook up their specialties, and then I have the job of taking all those special dishes, putting them together, and coming up with something that is even more extraordinary than any one of those combinations. That is just about impossible because all you would wind up with is a mish-mash.

Even if I could, I do not think there is any need to duplicate the job that, for example, Don Dodds did in summing up Tuesday's session. So, at the risk of being accused of perhaps missing some of the points that speakers have made, I think the most profitable approach for me is to back off one level of detail from the information that we have been presented with, and try to distill perhaps one or two key points out of it all.

Falling short

One of the points I would like to deal with briefly is our track record in this business. I think we have fallen a bit short of the mark in our business of communicating about wildlife. We have been exposed here to the analyses of a number of communication problems in recent years, in which we have seen extremist special-interest groups carry the day in the face of potentially pretty solid wildlife management propositions. The case studies we have had are specific examples that I might refer you to.

If you want to look at it in a little more global sense, you can look at the singular lack of success we have had in stemming the tide of habitat losses to competing resource users, even when the logical resource-use decisions in our eyes should have been in our favour. I do not think we have to reach very far to find a case close at hand, be it the loss or degradation of critical fish habitats, such as our West Coast salmon streams and estuaries, or the rapidly dwindling amount of Piping Plover habitat, or the equally alarming trends in the availability of habitat for most of the hunted populations of wildlife.

Why are we falling short of the mark? Certainly in many cases that we are familiar with it is not the lack of technical information, but perhaps the lack of political will or interest, or maybe the lack of sufficient public support. Why these two--a lack of political will and a lack of public support? I think it is because of the lack of effective communication from people like ourselves, for two reasons:

(1) The failure to build new bridges--we have heard that terminology used this week--new bridges in our search for solutions to the problems we face in our industry.

(2) The inability, on our part, to foster public and political support for the concepts of wildlife management in its broadest sense.

Somebody referred to the on-going yoke that we bear of some of the long-dead (or should be) wildlife management principles: "Smoky the Bear" syndromes and so forth. We have not done a very good job of communicating to the public the need for scientific wildlife management in the modern era.

New bridges

I want to just deal briefly with each of these two points. First of all our inability to build new bridges. An analysis of the current problem areas of wildlife management--maintenance of adequate habitat, quality and/or quantity, for virtually any wildlife species is probably the best example--will usually reveal the cause to be a competing use for the land by another sector, such as forestry, agriculture, hydro-electric development, or some form of non-renewable resource extraction.

For simplicity, let us look at forestry and the effects of forest management on ungulates. I think after Bill Young's presentation we all have to agree that forestry and wildlife should be fertile ground for integrated management approaches. But how often do wildlife administrators, when faced with a forestry-wildlife conflict, actually go out and seek a solution on the basis of the approaches advocated by Bill and by Monte Hummel? You know, things like open, optimistic and innovative approaches, a solution within the forestry sector itself. We do not venture very far out of our own discipline. Too often, I suspect, we assume the adversary stance or confine our search for solutions to those things we already know.

In the case of agriculture--we view this as a major competing land-user--I think it was referred to in this session as probably one of the tougher nuts we have to crack. Tom Crowther asked us all, "When was the last time you took a journalist out into the field to share your problems or successes?" Let me ask, "When was the last time you took an agriculturalist out to share your problems or your successes?"

I think that probably is enough said on the case for getting outside our discipline to build some new bridges, looking for solutions in things that perhaps are not all that familiar to us.

The constituents

I want to leave that for a moment now and just talk about the second perceived area of failure of communication--that with our constituents, be it the public, a sector of the public, or their elected representatives. Both of these issues were dealt with on Tuesday. Our keynote address and several of the subsequent speakers, including Monte Hummel and Roger Simmons, suggested that we may not have been too successful to date in creating a groundswell of support for wildlife management, wildlife conservation, and the specific programs we design to accomplish these ends. The reasons seemed to be pretty clearly laid out, and perhaps just a summary of a couple of them will refresh your mind.

First of all is the failure to appreciate the importance that public information and public information planning play in the success or failure of our management schemes. The only time we think about "smearing on PR" is when we get into a tough spot. Generally, when the need is realized in time, often there is an inability to develop an effective program of communicating the important information to the right audience; again, be that a portion of the public or their elected representatives. We have got to identify who needs the information if we are to succeed, what information they need, and how that information can be most attractively conveyed to ensure the maximum desired effect. All of our speakers collectively have given us the basic techniques for accomplishing these tasks, and Carl Radimer summed up by presenting them in the framework of his "RACE formula".

Given that we have, generally, fallen a bit short of the mark in the area of "Communicating about wildlife", and assuming that we collectively wish to do better, what are the chances of success, assuming that we can make full use of the expert advice we have heard this week? I make that basic assumption. My assessment is that the chances are reasonably good. I have a couple of reasons for this. Within the wildlife management community--if I could use that term to embrace this group--in the philosophy that this group collectively might represent, there is a far greater level of honest communication--I might call it mutual respect, I think that was the term that Monte used--now than has been the case in recent years. Thus I think there is a stronger likelihood of developing complementary and supportive initiatives.

My second reason for some optimism is that I think there has been a degree of maturing in environmental awareness within society that is tending to enable more or us to look at a question or a number of issues as being in the 90-kilometer speed range of Monte Hummel's speedometer. In other words, we are in that area where it is not black and it is not white. There are questions on both sides--perhaps there is room for compromise or some mutually acceptable conclusion.

We might look at a few examples. I can point to a few fairly quickly to illustrate this. One is the development of agreements between, or joint programs between, the wildlife federations and the naturalist groups in schemes such as the Heritage Marsh Program in Saskatchewan. These are good examples of that 90-kilometer speed range. If you look at the first annual report of Wildlife Habitat Canada, there are a number of projects that are listed in the co-operating organizations. There are some that would have been considered 10 or 15 years ago as strange bedfellows, but it is turning out to be a very positive relationship.

A third reason for optimism is that I see a progressively greater awareness of the interrelated nature of resource-use or management initiatives. I think this

is enabling not only the resource managers, but the informed elements of society, to appreciate the need for or, more correctly, the essential nature of integrating our efforts. If we look, there have been interesting examples in agriculture recently.

In terms of public awareness we have seen a couple of very positive signs of agriculture having to step beyond its own very limited bounds and be concerned about other things--the "Soils at risk" report of the Senate Agriculture, Forestry, and Fisheries Committee. A publication put out by the Alberta Environment Council basically says the same sorts of things--concerns about soil and water conservation; that take them beyond the traditional agricultural field. Another example, within the professional side of agriculture, is the publication that came out last year from the Agricultural Institute of Canada, "Will the bounty end?". This publication says exactly the same things; expressions of concern about soil and water conservation.

We can look within the bureaucracies themselves at some recent trends, say, in federal agriculture. We are not hearing quite as much about the very aggressive, probably short-sighted agri-food policy that was proposed a few years ago. Instead we are seeing a heightened concern in terms of policies, programs, and lack of recent budget cuts in their soil conservation programs. Similarly in provincial agricultural departments, although I am not aware of the details of this, I understand that the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture has recently hired a large number of soil conservation specialists, as they are increasing their emphasis in that area.

If we are willing to stretch our imaginations and become opportunistic in seizing upon some of these opportunities for bridge-building and, secondly, for effectively communicating our message, I think that substantial progress in the next few years is probably inevitable.

Some suggestions

I have been to a lot of meetings like this, and I think those of you who have also been on the North American circuit can very quickly develop an abhorrence of meetings where we get together and talk to one another, and sometimes invite somebody else in to say something to us; but very often these meetings serve only as a stimulus for increased hand-wringing on our part or perhaps, at the conclusion, the publication of a series of New Year's resolutions. It is not very often that something meaningful results. We get together and we do have some good discussions, but I think the general concensus is that the meetings themselves are just an excuse to get there and do business with individuals that you want to meet.

I would like to pose a couple of challenges to this group. I have not yet been in close communication with the Recommendations Committee, but I pose these to you and perhaps to the Recommendations Committee for consideration.

First of all, I would like to suggest that we give some thought to developing, collectively, an effective communication plan to transmit to the public those principles to which we can all agree, that are embraced in the "Wildlife policy for Canada". I have not read that document for a year, but I think if you were to circulate it to somebody walking down the street below the hotel here, and

ask what they thought of it, you would get a big shrug of the shoulders, primarily because it just does not say anything to that guy on the street. I rather suspect that there are a lot of politicians, with the exception of the specific wildlife ministers of the day, who would look at it and say the same thing. Probably they do not understand some of the jargon, maybe they do not understand the reasons for developing this policy. I think it might be worth considering that this group take the "Wildlife policy for Canada", or at least parts of it that we collectively consider as representing some of the principles of wildlife management in this country, and go on the campaign trail. Package that stuff in effective forms of communication, use the techniques--the appropriate ones that have been suggested to us this week--and focus on a public that we want to affect, and get out there and sell the message.

The second offering that I will toss out to you is to take advantage of the opportunity we have to crack that tough nut which we refer to as agriculture. Why do we not initiate some dialogue, both federally and provincially, with the agricultural sector. In here I might include not only departments of agriculture, federal and provincial, but also groups of agriculturalists themselves--the Agricultural Institute of Canada, a professional group, the farmers--with a view towards developing discussion that would result in the gradual development of an integrated resource conservation week, as an example. This might be viewed as a response to the recent federal news release on a soil conservation week. We now have a wildlife week; we have a forestry week; we have soil conservation week; probably next year we will have a water conservation week; then it will be God knows what else the year after that. We will have every week of the year plugged up with some of these things. The public will just be more confused about what it all means. So maybe the challenge is there potentially to build a bridge with agriculture.

In conclusion, I think that if we had a report card done on our performance in "Communicating about wildlife", perhaps done by our speakers this week, we would not get all that many As. There would be some Bs and some Cs, and some distinct failures, but I think we are at a point now, just simply having recognized the importance of this subject by having it as a topic for this group to discuss and deliberate over, that probably we do have the opportunity for some really positive initiatives in the next few years.

Update report

NATIONAL WILDLIFE WEEK

K.A. Brynaert
Canadian Wildlife Federation

The Canadian Wildlife Federation (CWF) published 104 950 kits for distribution: 89 250 English and 15 700 French. The topic featured in the 1985 program was "Responsible stewardship: The key to conservation".

Our classroom education kit consisted of a 16-page, four-colour booklet, a teachers' activity guide, and a poster announcing the Week. In addition, we inserted a Parks Centennial poster. We also included an evaluation sheet requesting teachers to respond to specific questions about their grade levels and the value of the kit as a teaching aid, and to offer comments on the format adopted in the kit.

Evaluation results

At the time of writing this report, we had received 392 responses. Highlights of the results were as follows:

- 57% were elementary teachers,
- 35% were secondary-school teachers,
- 69% considered the awards programs useful,
- 71% used the poster in their lesson planning,
- 58% used the booklet in their lesson planning,
- 61% used the teachers' guide in their lesson planning,
- 64% used the students' activities,
- 17% did not use the kit,
- 60% kept kits from previous years,
- 85% received the kit prior to the Week.

On a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 is most useful:

(1) Usefulness of the booklet as teaching aid -

17% rated the usefulness as a 3,
44% rated the usefulness as a 4,
28% rated the usefulness as a 5.

(2) Usefulness of teachers' guide as a teaching aid -

18% rated the usefulness as a 3,
44% rated the usefulness as a 4,
28% rated the usefulness as a 5.

(3) Usefulness of the poster as a teaching aid -

16% rated the usefulness as a 3,
30% rated the usefulness as a 4,
40% rated the usefulness as a 5.

(4) Usefulness of the students' hands-on activities -

17% rated the usefulness as a 3,
34% rated the usefulness as a 4,
35% rated the usefulness as a 5.

If we assume that the questionnaire respondents are a sample population of those educators who use the kit, the results are very positive and indicate that 80-85% of the educators using the material consider it a worthwhile teaching aid.

Participation

It is becoming increasingly apparent that more jurisdictions are becoming aware of the value of focusing public attention on wildlife resources and the activities of their department during National Wildlife Week. These efforts stimulate public interest in wildlife, and provide a timely opportunity for departments to generate public support and enthusiasm. We commend these initiatives in the hope that all remaining jurisdictions will develop similar programs on their own behalf.

While we are encouraged by these trends, we are disappointed that a greater overall effort has not been forthcoming to increase the exposure of the program in schools. Orders for the school kits continue to decline. This fact indicates to us that fewer teachers, and thus fewer students, benefit from the program.

We strongly urge all jurisdictions to take a long, hard look at their school programs conducted for National Wildlife Week. The rising impetus of anti-conservation groups and their influence on youngsters and teachers are already well known. More, not less, effort is needed on the part of all wildlife agencies and organizations to take every opportunity to ensure that our voice is heard by Canadian youth and educators. We cannot afford to cast this sector of society adrift, particularly during National Wildlife Week--the single, most important time to promote our work and our message.

We were also disappointed that the provinces of Saskatchewan and Quebec were not participants in the 1985 program. Discussions have been held with each agency for the purpose of ensuring their sponsorship and on-going involvement. We are hopeful that both will be active in the national effort to promote the program in this coming year.

CWF initiatives

As a way of setting an example, the CWF has conducted a review and evaluation of its involvement in the National Wildlife Week program, and ways in which we may make further contributions to stimulate greater awareness of the Week within schools and the constituency we represent. Among the various propositions we are considering, two courses of action appear feasible for the coming year: developing an informational program to serve our constituency and instituting a similar program for teachers who have expressed interest and played an active role in highlighting the Week in their class.

This latter item may be of interest to this conference. The program will include a newsletter published in both official languages, for release in September and in February of each year, containing information about CWF educational activities and services.

Its purpose will be to develop a direct line of communication with those educators who have demonstrated a willingness to do something positive for their students during the Week and at other times of the year. Through this network, we hope to help serve the interests of all jurisdictions by providing some groundwork in preparing educators each year for the Week, and encouraging them to maintain a continued interest within their classes and partake in wildlife learning experiences.

All teachers who have responded to the National Wildlife Week evaluation sheet and all educators who become involved in Project WILD will be among those included in the mailing of this newsletter.

Awards program (See page 155 for 1985 awards)

We are pleased to announce that Andrea Cameron, age 13, of Naramata Public School of Naramata, BC, was the recipient of the National Wildlife Week Achievement Award. In recognition of her achievement, Andrea has been made a Life Member of the Canadian Wildlife Federation. Her name has been inscribed on the National Wildlife Week trophy housed at the Canadian Wildlife Federation office in Ottawa. Andrea also received a certificate, plaque, and gift for her accomplishment.

The CWF is grateful for the sponsorship of the National Wildlife Week trophy by a CWF Director, the Hon. Rheal Belisle of the Senate of Canada. The trophy will feature the names of all students who have won the top honour in the Wildlife Week program since its inception, and will be prominently displayed at the federation's office in Ottawa.

All students in the "honourable mention", category were awarded a gift, a certificate of achievement, and a 1-year membership in the CWF. Their teachers received certificates for their participation, and their schools were presented with plaques commemorating their contribution towards instilling an interest and involvement in the National Wildlife Week program.

In the past, various jurisdictions have requested that they be permitted to submit their entries for awards in the fall of a given year. This was asked so that ample time would be available to display posters, etc. at various functions throughout the spring and summer after Wildlife Week. As a result, it is not possible to judge entries nationally until November or December. In our view, this period of time is too long for students, especially since students have moved to other grades during the new academic year. Commencing in 1986, therefore, we will be requesting all agencies to submit their entries by 15 May, so that we may complete our judging by the first week in June and notify all award recipients. Submissions will then be returned to provincial/territorial agencies for use in displays.

Last year we mentioned that part of the intent of instituting an award system was to encourage provincial and territorial wildlife departments to broaden the scope of submissions eligible for recognition and to include "Conservation youth projects". Our office has received numerous inquiries from educators regarding

the desirability of pursuing this course of action, since it is a more suitable way to highlight the work of an entire class as a submission for the awards. We therefore recommend that projects be accepted, in addition to posters, as eligible entries by all jurisdictions. CWF will undertake to provide a draft of guideline suggestions for this feature of the award program. The guidelines will be circulated to all participating agencies for their comments and use, and will be included in the 1986 package.

Topics for 1986, 1987 and 1988

The Canadian Wildlife Federation submits the following three topics for the next 3 years:

1986 - Water: Essential for wildlife!

1987 - Soil: Essential for wildlife!

1988 - Air: Essential for wildlife!

Each of these topics focuses attention on one aspect essential for wildlife and its habitat. Each is simple and relevant and can be dealt with effectively in a school kit.

The 3-year lead period will provide ample time for all jurisdictions to commence their planning activities for future programs. It will also permit the CWF to schedule an earlier delivery of the kit.

Our feed-backfrom participating jurisdictions indicates that straightforward, easy-to-handle-and-grasp topics are most successful within schools. Last year's topic, for example, posed several difficulties, the prime one being translating a complex, cumbersome concept into simple language and a meaningful package. We feel that by taking the simple, basic approach in these programs we will certainly derive a greater benefit from them. We strongly urge that our recommended topics be accepted by the conference.

Communicating to children

We have heard in the past 3 days, and certainly from my standpoint with a great deal of interest, about communication. I would like to compare what we are doing in terms of Wildlife Week, which in my view is one of the greatest opportunities to communicate; or perhaps I should go back and correct myself, what we are not doing. It is an opportunity to communicate at a level that I think is the most productive and the most vital area, and that is to the children. For those of you who have been involved with Wildlife Week material, I think we do a credible job in communicating to children. I think we can all do a better job, and what I mean by a better job is greater co-operation in terms of the distribution of Wildlife Week kits.

I have tracked back for the past 25 years, since the inception of the Wildlife Week program, and I stand here today and report to you that we are distributing 50% less material in 1985 than we did back 25 years ago. I think that is a pretty sad comment, and it certainly does not follow the idea of being good

communicators. I know that every jurisdiction, every agency, is faced with budget restraints. I would like you to know, for the record, that last year, without the inclusion of the administration or in-house participation of the Canadian Wildlife Federation on design and so on, the direct expenditures for the production of National Wildlife Week were $83 000. We recovered, by way of those participating agencies that purchase the materials from us, $32 000. I think that what I am trying to tell you is that we are putting our money where our mouth is, and I would certainly urge all agencies to give really serious consideration, in the future, to taking this program and making it a really good communication piece to get our message across.

1985 National Wildlife Week Poster Contest Winners

Winner

Tanya Stefanec
Fisher Branch Collegiate Institute
Fisher Branch, Manitoba

Age 9, Grade 4
Teacher: Neil Parado

Honourable mention

The class of Betty Clemens
Waterloo-Oxford District Secondary School
Baden, Ontario

Ages 14-19
Teacher: Betty Clemens

Douglas Ireland
Nakasuk School
Frobisher Bay, Northwest Territories

Age 12, Grade 6
Teacher: Joseph Morneau. Principal: John MacPherson

Sonya Bylsma
Belleville District Christian School
Belleville, Ontario

Age 12, Grade 6
Teacher: Nancy Tamminga

Kelsey Kure (boy)
Spruce View School
Spruce View, Alberta

Age 11
Teacher: Edna Lewis

Lorie Nickerson
Cape Sable Island Elementary
Shelbourne County, Nova Scotia

Age 11, Grade 6
Teacher: W. Georgia Ross. Principal: Alfred Newell

Andria MacAulay
Salmon River Elementary
Truro, Nova Scotia

Age 10, Grade 4
Teacher: Karen MacKinnon-Smith

Rolena Snow
Gander Academy
Gander, Newfoundland

Age 12, Grade 6
Teacher: James Cornish

Lianne Ledwon
Victoria, British Columbia

Age 13, Grade 7
Teacher: Marg Kavanagh

Kenny Laybolt
Souris Consolidated
Souris, Prince Edward Island

Age 14, Grade 8
Teacher: Fred Cheverie

Jennifer Bennett
Gander Academy
Gander, Newfoundland

Age 11, Grade 6
Teacher: James Cornish

National Wildlife Week (2)

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

R.C. Thompson (Manitoba Wildlife Branch) said that Manitoba would like to emphasize what Mr. Brynaert had said about National Wildlife Week, in which Manitoba had been very actively involved. He wanted to pass on their appreciation to the Canadian Wildlife Federation for their great effort across the country, and their support and co-operation. Just for the sake of discussion, Manitoba wanted to offer an alternative topic to be considered for 1986--that being "Wildlife in jeopardy". They did not want to take anything away from the land, water, and air themes, which were extremely important, but the theme of "Wildlife in jeopardy" and the need to communicate about it was equally so.

The theme of "Wildlife in jeopardy" would do several things, he continued. It would focus on important wildlife species, and also would perhaps clarify some misconceptions about what was and was not endangered. It also would be a theme that could be very effectively portrayed in doodle posters such as he had there. As Ken Brynaert knew, that was something that really focused a lot of attention on wildlife in Manitoba. He thought it exemplified the topic, and also would point out that body language was important in getting the message across. For more details on National Wildlife Week and techniques used in Manitoba, they had included details in a "Canadian wildlife administration" article.

K.A. Brynaert (Canadian Wildlife Federation) thought that it might be worthy of note that the Manitoba Wildlife Federation was the recipient of the Doug Clarke Memorial Award this year for their submission in the Wildlife Week Program that was conducted in the Province of Manitoba last year.

B. Tétreault (Canadian Wildlife Service) proposed, because of the events coming up in 1987, the theme of "100 years of wildlife conservation in Canada" for 1987.

W. Young (Canadian Forestry Association of British Columbia) said that his national association chose the topic for National Forest Week across the country each year. He was amazed at the potential for the integration of forestry and wildlife habitat objectives in every place he turned. It was not because people wilfully opposed such things--it was mainly a lack of understanding, a lack of communication, and a lack of appreciation. He wondered if somewhere down the line National Wildlife Week and National Forest Week could not intertwine for one year, and have a common slogan and try to look at the potential for habitat development and a forestry mixture. There was an old saying that went around that a forester could create or destroy more wildlife habitat with one decision than a wildlife biologist could in all his career. He firmly believe that, and thought that there was potential if they could get it out of the negative framework into a positive one, and somewhere down the line maybe the two organizations could choose a common theme for one year and both could attempt to blend in an integration process. His week was the first week in May and he understood that theirs was in April, so maybe with a little sculduggery they could get it into the same week.

D. Hagan (Ontario Wildlife Branch) said that he wanted to make a comment on the material. He did not know about other jurisdictions, but in National Wildlife Weeks gone by, quite a few years ago, he remembered that they were not making efficient use of the educational materials that were being provided in the old Department of Lands and Forests in Ontario. A lot of the material was rotting on shelves after National Wildlife Week came and went. He thought they were making better use of what they had now, and since it cost them something, they were actually tightening up on the use of it. Maybe they were ordering less but contacting more kids in the final analysis.

K.A. Brynaert thought that was a fair statement, and certainly they had recognized that fact.

D. Minty (Department of Culture, Recreation, and Wildlife, Newfoundland/Labrador) said that the task of choosing a topic each year for National Wildlife Week was a very challenging one because they had to pay attention to the very broad scope of wildlife across a very big country, and pick topics that were equally applicable in all parts of the country. But there was a danger in picking a broad enough topic that also was equally important in all parts of the country. The danger was that it got so broad that one could not get a hook into it to create meaningful displays and have meaningful events in each province--especially for children. He thought that the CWF was doing a noble job in addressing this task, but wanted to propose that attempts be made to make it more specific than it had been; more specific than what was proposed for the next 3 years. The three topics--air, soil, and water--were still too broad and vague. He much preferred Manitoba's suggestion of "Wildlife in jeopardy". They could really get a hook into that one.

He had been playing with another idea, he continued, and was not convinced in his own mind that it was a good route to follow, but one possibility would be to pick one animal group each year, i.e. owls or the deer family or something like that. In that way the materials that were produced each year could serve as building blocks. One of the faults he had found with the material that had been produced in recent years was that it was very repetitive. One booklet was very similar, a rehash of much of the material that had come before. He did not see them as being terribly complementary, between one year's production and the next. He thought that by following an animal grouping type of approach the material would be complementary and would serve as building blocks for teachers each year. The material would not age at all. What they produced one year on deer would always be applicable. They could build into it the important concepts of population dynamics, the nature of ecosystems and so on, focusing on any one of those animal groups. But he was not convinced that that was a good approach. For 1986 in particular, a very good theme would be Manitoba's suggestion of "Wildlife in jeopardy".

A second point he said he wanted to make was a request that audio-visual material be produced on a national scale each year in support of the theme. It need not be terribly expensive material, like a film for instance. A film-strip on the theme could be produced at a national level and could be made available for purchase by the schools. The United States did that, he thought, just about every year and the material they produced was somewhat better than they might be able to produce on a provincial scale, simply because it was done on a national level. He proposed that the CWF consider the development of a film-strip to support each theme each year.

R.C. Thompson said, "Now comes the bribe!" In the light of what Denis Minty had just said, Manitoba would be prepared to develop the doodle poster and distribute it to other organizations, provincial and territorial, across Canada so that they could see if they wanted to use it as well.

L. Whistance-Smith (Ontario Wildlife Branch) thought that Ontario would have to agree that they would like to see a topic that was much more graspable to the teachers, so that they could get the kids' teeth into it too. Denis Minty's points were very good. They would support Manitoba's idea of endanged species next year, and certainly liked Mr. Tétreault's "100 years" idea for 1987 as it fitted in well. One of the things that they were concerned about with the suggested topics, the first being water, was that this was rather broad, and also they had had that excellent kit 2 years ago on "Wetlands and wildlife", and it was a little soon after that for water again. Water was a little too broad from Ontario's point of view.

K.A. Brynaert commented that the proposal put forward by the CWF for those three topics was for discussion. He did not have any strong feelings. "Wildlife in jeopardy" would be an excellent topic--certainly one that they could, to use an expression,"do a number on".

A. Smith (Prince Edward Island Wildlife Unit) said that his province had grappled with Wildlife Week in working with the teachers, and there seemed to be one common thread, which was in trying to relay information to children that they could understand in a meaningful way. His province did lots of work with 4H groups, and with that in mind, and looking at the recurring cycle of kids coming up every 4 or 5 years--if they were targeting on one age group--they thought it would be very nice if they could develop a theme on "What you can do for wildlife" and key it in on a habitat issue. It could be very expansive. It could involve water; it could involve soil; it could involve forests, as Bill Young had mentioned.

They had the opportunity, at the invitation of their PEI Forestry Division, to put up a display during National Forest Week this year. It was the first time and he thought it was a great integration opportunity. They were being continually asked for material that they could disseminate for kids to take back to the farm or back to their community and actually do something with it. One could even expand it to the urban area, because it was broad enough that one could almost duplicate their material from 4 or 5 years ago: "Wildlife in your back-yard"--that type of thing. One could bring this into play in dealing with the various habitat issues.

K.A. Brynaert said that they had looked at the proposition of developing a component that would be more directed towards the students themselves. The difficulty was production costs. If one took the 105 000 kits that they distributed and looked at that even in terms of every one of those teachers having only one class--an average of 20 to 25 children--they were talking about endless production costs. Getting something directly into the hands of the students would be a very costly proposition.

A. Smith replied that he did not mean that each student would be supplied with material, but rather that the material would be something that could be easily

conveyed and the students could pick it up quite quickly, or maybe the teacher could have it reproduced.

During the discussion on proposed recommendations, the theme of "Wildlife in jeopardy", proposed by Manitoba, was discussed in detail. Ontario was opposed to the wording because the Federation of Ontario Naturalists had put out an endangered species kit using that title, and it was almost a copyright. After some discussion, the recommendations were passed concerning themes for 1986 and 1987; 1986 was to deal with endangered wildlife, but the wording of the theme was left to the discretion of the Canadian Wildlife Federation. (See Recommendations Nos. 7 and 8.)

Update report

"CANADIAN WILDLIFE ADMINISTRATION"

Publishing specifications and editorial guidelines

R.C. Goulden
Manitoba Wildlife Branch

Background

"Canadian wildlife administration" (CWA) has been published in conjunction with the Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference since the inaugural edition produced by Manitoba in 1975. It grew from a resolution passed at the 1973 conference stating that:

> a three-man subcommittee be set up by the conference chairman to investigate the feasibility and desirability of publishing a journal covering various resource management topics, especially in the areas now covered by biological journals, for example, training, licensing, innovations, public participation, and so on. This committee should circulate a report with recommendations before the next Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference for a decision at that time.

The following list provides a résumé of publishers of this journal to date:

1975 Manitoba
1976 Alberta
1977 British Columbia
1978 Saskatchewan
1979 Quebec
1980 Ontario
1981 Atlantic Provinces - Prince Edward Island
- Nova Scotia
- New Brunswick
- Newfoundland
1982 Canadian Wildlife Service
1983 Northwest Territories and Yukon
1984 Manitoba
1985 Alberta

Every jurisdiction has had the responsibility of publishing this review, some more than once. This journal has covered a wide range of themes and topics, which generally have only reflected the original objective, that being: "To foster communication among wildlife agencies in the area of program administration".

Several reviews of CWA since its inception have emphasized its value and have pointed out various attributes, including its function as a focus for the administrative aspects of wildlife management and as a medium for the distribution of information about wildlife management in Canada, including:

(1) aspects of wildlife law,

(2) regulations,

(3) policy,

(4) organizational arrangements,

(5) innovative programs, and

(6) updated personnel directories.

Further, Recommendation No. 14 of the 48th Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference, held in Timmins, Ont. in 1984, reconfirmed the value of the journal and recommended its continuance.

Key questions remain, however, concerning the publication's objectives, its value, audience, adequacy of guidelines, and worthwhile alternatives. It is held that a significant mismatch of objectives and subsequent methods of attainment has developed over the life of this publication. Furthermore, recent experience has shown that there still may be questions on the purpose and mechanics of the publication. It is also apparent, from editorial decisions required on articles submitted, that there remains uncertainty concerning the scope, purpose, audience, and format for the articles themselves.

Clarifications addressing the preceding points and emphasis of the publication's value are essential, given the costs and time commitments for its production. Consequently, Manitoba agreed to the task of reviewing and assessing editorial policy and publishing specifications for the 1985 Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference.

Accordingly, this review encompasses detail on the following categories for "Canadian wildlife administration":

(1) Content

(2) Editorial and production responsibilities

(3) Contributors' responsibilities

(4) Publishing specifications

(5) Costs

(6) Future production

(7) Annual production schedule.

(1) Content

The publication will consists of:

(i) Cover
(ii) Inside cover pages
(iii) Table of contents
(iv) Theme articles
(v) Administrative updates
(vi) Personnel directory.

(i) Cover

- Cover will include the title "Canadian wildlife administration", the month, and the year.

- Colour and illustration is left to the discretion of the agency responsible for publication

- Type and paper will be consistent with publishing specifications (section 4).

(ii) Inside cover pages

- Inside cover page (page 1) will display the title "Canadian wildlife administration", the theme of the year's publication, the month and year of production, the volume number, and the logo(s) or symbol(s) of the producing agency.

- The reverse (page 2) will include the name(s) of the editor(s) and illustrator(s) and any other publication credits.

- Type and paper will be consistent with publishing specifications.

(iii) Table of contents

- Table of contents (page 3) will list, by province in alphabetical order, the titles of submitted articles followed by "Administrative update", following by "Personnel directory".

- Type will be consistent with publishing specifications.

(iv) Theme articles

- This section constitutes the major part of the publication. It consists of articles submitted by the participating agencies relevant to a central theme as specified by the publishing agency.

- Articles submitted on the theme must conform to the stated purpose of the publication. Reports of a purely biological nature are not acceptable, as there are already a number of outlets for information of this kind. Examples of submitted articles (subject to the theme) could include:

  (a) Evaluations of wildlife management practices.

  (b) Reports (perhaps abridged) on special studies relating to wildlife management or administration.

(c) Innovative approaches to wildlife management or administrative problems.

(d) Management notes - brief items of interest to managers/administrators.

(e) Wildlife agency staff development.

- Articles will address items of interest to wildlife managers/administrators, natural resource ministers, and deputy ministers, and may be of interest to managers of other resources such as lands, forests, fisheries, and water.

- Participating agencies may submit a maximum of three articles, maximum 3000 words each. The publishing agency is responsible for final selection of articles.

- Illustrations must be camera-ready, black-and-white.

- Photographs must be 203 x 254 mm (8 x 10 in.), black-and-white. Captions must be affixed to photos.

(v) Administrative updates

- The "Administrative updates" section consists of short, informative pieces on organizational or personnel changes, changes in wildlife law or policy, and the rationale behind changes, budgets, licensing systems and fees, training programs, or new agreements. These may also include obituaries of well-known wildlife agency personnel.

- The publication editor may request submissions from all participating agencies on one or more of these topics, or agencies may submit information voluntarily.

(vi) Personnel directory

- The "Personnel directory" consists of names, addresses, phone numbers and Telex numbers of key agency personnel.

- Each participating agency will provide the producing agency with a current head-office mailing address and Telex number, and a current listing of key personnel, their position titles, telephone numbers, and mailing addresses (if different from head office).

(2) Editorial and production responsibilities

It is the responsibility of the publication's contributors to adhere to the preceding guidelines. It is the responsibility of the producing agency to appoint an editor or editorial committee to ensure compliance with the guidelines, and to assume responsibility for all aspects of production.

Duties of the editor or editorial committee:

(i) Decide on theme for the year's publication if this has not been arranged at earlier Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference or Wildlife Directors' Meeting.

(ii) Forward a request for submissions of theme articles, administrative updates, personnel directories, and the number of copies required (French or English) to all wildlife directors or agency heads by 1 September. In the request, advise that all submissions must be received by the editor in final form in both languages by 31 December.

(iii) Send a reminder for submissions to all directors or agency heads by 1 December.

(iv) Obtain commitment, quotes, and deadline requirement from illustrator, typesetter, layout artist, printer, and translator.

(v) Review all submissions, returning to contributors those articles that are not appropriate.

(vi) Compile theme articles, administrative updates, and personnel director.

(vii) Prepare text of cover, inside cover pages, and table of contents in French and English.

(viii) Forward complete package to typesetter.

(ix) Proofread all typeset copy and return to typesetter for corrections.

(x) Proofread all corrections.

(xi) Forward package to illustrator and layout artist with illustrations.

(xii) Proofread layout and illustrations.

(xiii) Forward completed, laid-out type and illustrations to printer. Order sufficient copies to meet requirements, approximately 1800 English, 250 French, with a small overrun to cover additional requests.

(xiv) Request 50 advance copies in each language and proofread advance copies.

(xv) Forward approved advance copies to Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference in June.

(xvi) Advise printer to continue production.

(xvii) Distribute final copies to participating agencies, filling orders by 15 July.

(3) Contributors' responsibilities

(i) Meet all deadlines.

(ii) Complete submissions in final form. There should be no grammatical, typographical, translation, or content errors.

(iii) Adhere to the theme of the year's publication, and to its administrative intent.

(iv) Submit articles in French and English.

(v) Submit articles to the editor.

(vi) Advise the editor at time of submission as to the number of copies of the publication required.

(4) Publishing specifications

Publication size: 215 x 279 mm (8½ x 11 in.).

Paper: Cover - corded 1-side 10 pt., Cornwall

Interior - Plainfield

Binding: Perfect (glued)

Type:

Cover,	
Title -	Helvetica bold 24 pt.
Date -	Helvetica bold 45 pt.
Inside Cover,	
Title -	Helvetica bold 24 pt.
Theme -	Helvetica bold 20 pt.
Volume date -	Helvetica bold 20 pt.
Editor/illustrator -	Helvetica bold 10 pt.
Table of contents,	
Title -	Helvetica bold 16 pt.
Province -	Helvetica bold 10 pt.
Article -	Helvetica medium 10 pt.
Page no. -	Helvetica medium 10 pt.
Administrative update -	Helvetica bold 10 pt.
Personnel director -	Helvetica bold 10 pt.
Body,	
Province heading -	Helvetica medium 12 pt.
Article title -	Helvetica bold 24 pt.
Subtitles -	Helvetica bold 18 pt.
Text -	Helvetica medium 10/11 pt.
Subheadings -	Helvetica bold 12 pt.
Columnwidth -	2 x 18 pica (front and back)

(5) Costs

Production costs are to be borne in entirety by the producing agency. These costs, which are a product of the preceding publishing specifications, will vary from year to year, province to province. Distribution expenses (i.e. shipping bulk request to participating agencies) are also borne by the producing agency. To reduce production costs, agencies may co-operate in production of one edition.

The production schedule should be adhered to as closely as possible in order to reduce costs. Requesting "rush" jobs can increase the cost of production by as much as 50%. Costs also may be minimized by ensuring that the copy submitted for typesetting is correct and in final form. Typesetters charge for "customers' alterations" after typesetting is completed. The following is a break-down of costs incurred by Manitoba in the 1984 publication for reference:

English:	2000 copies -	$6100	15% tax	$7000
French:	200 copies -	$2500	tax	$2700
Total costs:				$9700

(6) Future production

Each government agency will take its turn in producing "Canadian wildlife administration". The order will follow the pattern established over the last 20 years and is as follows:

Volume XI	1985 - Alberta
Volume XII	1986 - British Columbia
Volume XIII	1987 - Saskatchewan
Volume XIV	1988 - Quebec
Volume XV	1989 - Ontario
Volume XVI	1990 - Canadian Wildlife Service
Volume XVII	1991 - The Atlantic Provinces (collectively or singly)
Volume XVIII	1992 - Yukon and Northwest Territories (collectively or singly)
Volume XIX	1993 - Manitoba.

(7) Annual production schedule: "Canadian wildlife administration"

- Appoint editor/editorial committee	1 July
- Request submissions	1 September
- Contact illustrator, typesetter, translator, layout artist, and printer	1 October
- Forward "Reminder for submissions"	1 December
- Deadline for submissions	31 December
- Review submissions and compile	1 January
- Prepare text of cover, inside cover page and table of contents	15 January
- Forward to typesetter	15 January
- Forward to illustrator, layout	15 February
- Forward to printer	15 March
- Receive advance copies	1 May
- Forward advance copies to FPWC	Early June
- Distribute copies	1 July

Conclusion

"Canadian wildlife administration" is a worthwhile publication. Various agencies have no doubt questioned this statement when they have been faced with the onerous task of justifying budgets, exhorting writers, pleading with layout technicians, and dealing with printers.

All in all, the seemingly endless frustrations and efforts required pale in comparison to the satisfaction of having a product that is appreciated and used by private and government wildlife agencies across Canada. Adherence to specifications, guidelines, and production schedules should reduce anxieties in producing the publication and make it even more useful for wildlife management and information programs.

Update report

NATIONAL COLLOQUIUM ON WILDLIFE CONSERVATION

J. Cinq-Mars
Canadian Wildlife Service

As most of you probably recall, it was announced at the Wildlife Ministers' meeting held in Toronto last January that Environment Canada, in co-operation with the Province of Ontario, would hold a National Wildlife Conservation Colloquium this coming fall. The Colloquium will take place in Ottawa probably in November 1985.

This meeting will be basically a symposium that will gather together experts from various fields, but this one will have the special format of a workshop. It will essentially be a meeting of experts and politicians--Ministers from provincial and territorial jurisdictions--who will look at new ways of funding wildlife programs. More specifically, it is necessary to look at innovative ways or techniques available to support new wildlife programs and opportunities. The purpose of the Colloquium is not to look at possibilities for raising new money to support existing programs in the government of Canada. Those attending this workshop are likely to be provincial and territorial Ministers, key representatives of national NGOs and the private sector, and wildlife professionals from across this country.

The topics to be discussed, or to be presented by the experts, will most probably cover the following aspects:

- an excise tax on sporting goods;

- funding techniques to support habitat acquisition or habitat protection programs, namely mortgage reliefs or income tax check-off mechanisms, as well as other techniques available to governments;

- the principles of accessing these new funds and allocating them to NGOs and provincial and territorial governments.

Exchange of ideas

The Colloquium will last for two days. The Steering Committee intends to precirculate papers to the invited people to facilitate their analysis and preparation of positions on each of them. At the meeting, brief presentations of the papers prepared by the expert speakers will be made, so that ample time for discussion and question periods between all Ministers is allowed for.

A plenary session will allow the participants to exchange ideas on all these presentations and make recommendations for the implementation of one or the other. The chairman will prepare a set of recommendations that have gathered positive responses from those attending the Colloquium. It is intended that these recommendations will be followed up by specific task forces, which will have the responsibility of hammering out the details of each one and overseeing their implementation.

These points summarize the approach taken by the Steering Committee in preparing the Colloquium. I would think that very soon our Minister will make a public announcement on the date of the event, followed by formal invitations to representatives of major national NGOs and of provincial and territorial governments.

Update report

RAMSAR CONVENTION

J.H. Patterson
Canadian Wildlife Service

It is a pleasure to announce that Canada will be hosting the next meeting of contracting parties to the RAMSAR Convention in 1987. This will take place in Regina from 27 May through to 5 June. It is a good coincidence that Canada can host this meeting to coincide with the 100th anniversary of Last Mountain Lake, the first migratory bird sanctuary, we think, in the western hemisphere.

The meeting will actually be in two parts. There is an extraordinary conference to consider and adopt amendments to the Convention. This will be followed by an ordinary conference that will focus on international efforts to conserve and protect wetlands. Since the last meeting of the RAMSAR Convention in Holland last year, Canada has been very active as a member of a task force to the Convention to consider amendments to the language of the Convention, consider options for a permanent secretariat function to the Convention, and also make arrangements for the next meeting. The meeting took place in Holland last month and good progress was made, I think to the satisfaction of all. From the input we have from the provinces and territories and the private sector in Canada, they seemed satisfied.

In order to organize the upcoming meeting in Regina we are forming a committee that will have representatives of the non-governmental environmental organizations, provinces, territories, and the Canadian Wildlife Service. We hope to get this group working in the very near future.

The 1987 meeting provides a really exciting opportunity to have Canada take further leadership in the implementation of the RAMSAR Convention. I think there are many sites across this country that could be dedicated, as part of this meeting in Regina, to keep Canada way out in front as the world leader in protecting wetlands of international importance. I am not saying this so much in a self-serving way for Canada, but we do have a tremendous impact on wetland conservation in other parts of the world, certainly in Central and South America, and this dovetails with a long-term strategy of working co-operatively with countries in that area through cost-sharing of wetland inventories, our Latin American Program, etc. I cannot overestimate the importance of this type of activity in helping other people, other countries to recognize the value of wetlands and take action to protect them.

Update report

INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR THE CONSERVATION OF NATURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES (IUCN)

K.A. Brynaert
Canadian Wildlife Federation

In November of 1984 I attended the IUCN Conference, representing the Canadian Wildlife Federation. There are two aspects of that conference that I feel should be brought to the attention of this conference, particularly in the light of our discussions during the past two days.

Greenpeace

The first of these is Canada's position and actions regarding the admission of Greenpeace as a member of IUCN. I am sure most of you are aware of the Canadian government's official position at the outset of the IUCN Conference: namely, that Canada opposed Greenpeace International's membership application on the basis that Greenpeace had demonstrated, in some of their actions and activities, that they subscribe to taking the law into their own hands to promote their objectives. Canada submitted a very strong statement in this regard at the outset of the IUCN Conference. This statement was responded to by a supporter for Greenpeace.

In his wisdom, the IUCN meeting chairman ruled that the matter of Greenpeace International's membership application would be dealt with later on in the agenda. There was considerable initiative on the part of those who were opposed to Greenpeace International's membership (in co-operation with the government representatives who were there) to encourage IUCN members and member-nations to support the Canadian position. Unfortunately, midway through the conference, because of pressure that was applied back in Canada, instructions were received by the Canadian delegation that they were to cease and desist in their efforts. It was my understanding that the matter was to be left entirely up to non-governmental organizations, and that those NGOs should resolve what was perceived to be "their" problem.

Unfortunately, when one examines who the non-governmental members of IUCN are, I think it is fair to say that the predominance of the membership is heavily weighted in favour of organizations who subscribe to the non-consumptive use philosophy of wildlife. I say "heavily weighted" because I was able to identify that, out of a membership of some 180 non-governmental organizations, possibly six or eight would be supportive of the "use principle" as opposed to over a hundred that represented the other view. I have to admit that, personally, I found this situation somewhat embarrassing, since I put considerable effort towards supporting the Canadian position, only to discover in what forum the real decision was going to be made.

Ultimately, Canada would not ask the nations we had solicited (in support of our resolution) to honour their commitment. We all know the results. Because of Canada's abstention, we lost the support that we had initially gained. Greenpeace was admitted as a member. I felt that certainly Canada's position to oppose the application was justifiable.

What the whole matter brought home to me was the seriousness of the strong influence of the animal rights, the "anti-use", people. The influence that they have is not just in IUCN; I have experienced this also at the International Whaling Commission meetings, and it is certainly evident in CITES. These groups are very successful in influencing international decisions, and have a direct impact and influence on how wildlife will or will not be managed, not just in this country but around the world. The arguments they put forward are not based on science. They are based on emotion. But, for some unexplainable reason, official representatives from countries vote in favour of propositions that they know are not based on a sound conservation or scientific basis. In some instances, it is based on an attitude of "it doesn't effect me, so why not?".

In other instances, and again this was certainly demonstrated at CITES, there are countries making decisions whose representatives' way was paid by animal rights groups, because they had already committed themselves to vote in a certain fashion. In my view, this is a dangerous situation, because it undermines the credibility of organizations like IUCN, the International Whaling Commission, and CITES. I heard numerous comments to this effect at CITES, and I am sure Bert Tétreault would confirm this. Some countries have suggested that "if this continues, we are getting out".

Animal rights issue

The second issue I would like to mention is the Convention on Animal Rights--the same convention that was put forward at the Botswana CITES, floated at IUCN, and floated again at the Buenos Aires CITES, and will be floated again at some other international conference. It is alarming to watch the progress of this document. Each time it is floated, it gains one or two more supporters. It is the most frightening document I have ever read. If it ever succeeds, I do not think we will have to worry about management because "Mother Nature" is going to look after everything. I suggest that you (if you do not already) should monitor this closely because one day, in some forum, be it the United Nations or wherever, you will find that this document has been accepted. There is that possibility.

One might ask: "How do we respond to this?"; "what action should we take?". It is the view of the Canadian Wildlife Federation that what is required, certainly as it relates to IUCN, is greater participation, a better balance. What we need is a strong and balanced membership in these international organizations, a greater interest on the part of provincial governments and non-governmental organizations in what is taking place in these forums. I think that this course of action is absolutely essential.

At our annual meeting held in Calgary, the Canadian Wildlife Federation asked all of our provincial affiliates to become members in the IUCN. I have been encouraging this course of action throughout the United States and to other organizations. It is interesting that the International Fur Institute has made application and been accepted for membership in IUCN. By providing a balance, we will serve not only our own purpose, but we will also make IUCN and other bodies more effective. There is no question that the people involved in carrying out the work of organizations like the IUCN are just as concerned about what is happening as I am personally, and as are a number of other people with whom I have spoken.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I just want to reiterate my words. I think if we are going to communicate the value of wildlife and the wise use of wildlife, not only within our own country but around the world, we must look at what is going on very seriously and take every opportunity to bring about change.

Update report

"WORLD CONSERVATION STRATEGY"

D. Munro
Canadian Wildlife Federation

I attended the Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference in 1980, which was the year that the "World conservation strategy" (WCS) was launched. At that time I had the pleasure of introducing it to you. Now, 5 years later, I want to say a few words about what has happened since then, and what we see happening in the next few years with respect to the Strategy.

First, let me take a few minutes to review what the Strategy is. I expect you will recall that the main message of the "World conservation strategy" is that "conservation can take place only in the context of rational development and development can endure only if conservation is achieved". In other words, the theme of the Strategy is "sustainable development".

That is a theme that I think is almost universally acceptable except to extremists. Therefore it is a theme that we can sell and that we can make work to the advantage of wildlife. Three specific objectives are outlined and justified in the Strategy:

> First, the maintenance of essential ecological processes and life support systems. This includes managing waste disposal and pollution control; it means ensuring that various natural mechanisms upon which we depend, such as the pollination of important plants by insects, can endure.
>
> The second objective of the WCS is to ensure the maintenance of genetic diversity. In other words, let us not lose species. They are unique and they are irreplaceable. Even if we do not see that they are of any particular practical value now, they may be some time. If they are not of practical economic value, they may have a value that we are not able to measure in dollars--some aesthetic value--and if we want to push the argument further we could proclaim a moral obligation to ensure that we do not eliminate these species.
>
> The third objective of the WCS is to ensure the sustainable use of those renewable resources that we do utilize to meet our needs. In other words: "use the interest - don't use the capital". There are many other ways of putting it, but I do not need to elaborate.

Unique document

The Strategy was exceedingly well received for an international proclamation. I think it is unique among international documents proclaiming that this or that should be done, because 5 years after it was issued it is still something that is alive and seen as a means of guiding and planning for effective action. What has still to be done to implement it? Some things have to be accomplished at the international level, and these require the collaboration of states in developing new laws and regulations. One of the prime examples, of course, is the managing

of atmospheric emissions. Some progress is being made in that respect, but not as much as we in this country, or in the Scandinavian countries, would like, because we are still suffering from the problems of acid rain. There are other things that have to be done internationally. The quality of river discharges to the sea needs more attention, for example. I will not list more of them--you probably know them well yourselves.

Perhaps the most important needs are those that must be met nationally and even locally. One of the vehicles for doing this is to formulate a national or a subnational conservation strategy. What is a conservation strategy? It is a statement of objectives that would be in harmony with those of the WCS. It defines the relationship of those objectives to social goals. It defines the interactions between conservation and development. For example, if you establish goals for managing, shall we say, a water supply or a species, there will be certain activities that you will need to undertake to achieve those goals. If you then examine the sorts of development activities that are going on, and see in what way those activities and the activities that you have deemed necessary for conservation interrelate, you will have set up a matrix that enables you to evaluate development activities and goals in relation to conservation activities and goals, and vice versa. For each cell in the matrix where these activities intersect, you identify either opportunities to make the two activities have a synergistic effect--make them contribute to each other--or areas where there has to be some compromise or adjustment of goals. This is a rational process of looking at resource-use issues.

If you go through this process systematically, you can end up with an action plan, with a definition of programs needed for both conservation and development. You can assign priorities to programs and schedule them. You can provide for wildlife interests, for the interests of people in industry, and in agriculture. You can provide for the interests of governments as a whole, a plan that will enable them to decide what their priorities are and what they need to do in order to ensure that development is sustainable and that we achieve conservation. A conservation strategy does not mean that everything ends up favouring wildlife or fishing; it does mean that the accommodation or conservation and development has been defined on the most rational and equitable basis.

Ottawa conference

From 31 May to 5 June next year, in Ottawa, we are convening an international conference to examine what has been done around the world to implement the "World conservation strategy". The Canadian Wildlife Federation, Environment Canada, IUCN, World Wildlife Fund International, the United Nations Environment Program, UNESCO--the list is getting longer--are the primary sponsors. We have the program quite well planned now. It will provide ample opportunity to expose progress and problems in implementation of the Strategy; to discuss how the WCS might be modified to make it a more meaningful plan for action now; and to exchange experiences as to how you go about implementing it. I think it will be a worthwhile and constructive conference.

I have spoken a bit about the process that is involved in preparing a national conservation strategy. In Canada, of course, given the distribution of responsibility between the levels of government, this responsibility falls most heavily on the provinces. The Government of Canada, through Environment Canada,

has endorsed the Strategy, and has examined federal programs to see where they are in harmony with the Strategy. But most of the planning that needs to be done should be at the provincial level, and in a number of provinces some action is under way.

In Alberta, through the good offices of Elmer Kure, the Environment Council of Alberta has taken up the task of preparing a conservation strategy for that province. Alberta, I think, is fortunate in having an institution like its Environment Council, which has a staff, has sources of funding, is at arms-length from government, and bases most of its actions on the activities of NGOs. I am certainly pleased that the Council has undertaken this initiative. They have assigned staff time and money to it, and they are making good progress.

In British Columbia we have a Steering Committee and a Founding Executive Group who have planned a provincial conservation strategy. We are moving ahead, but not as quickly as we would like, because we are trying to raise private money in order to take the process at least to the point where it has sufficient strength to ensure that a good job is done.

In Ontario, as I understand it, the provincial government has given a contract to the Conservation Council of Ontario to examine provincial programs to see if they are in harmony with the objectives of the Strategy, following which I understand that they will decide whether or not they want to take another step and in fact devise a provincial conservation strategy.

In Quebec a conservation group headed by Harvey Mead of Quebec City is generating some action there. I am not aware of the details.

In each of the three Maritime Provinces an informal group, involving both NGOs and government, has been formed to lay plans for provincial conservation strategies.

I think that is a pretty good record. It would be a good thing if the other provinces would move in that direction as well, and if the action was intensified and accelerated in all the provinces.

It is worth remarking that we live in times of apparent political change, in which there is a different emphasis on how governments should manage their affairs. It does not really matter whether the change has been from Liberal to Conservative or Conservative to Liberal. I think the same sort of motives underlie the voters who brought about those changes, and they will have somewhat the same results. We are concerned, for example, with trying to streamline government, with trying to cut costs, and with trying to reduce deficits.

As a service

We all agree that these are good objectives and that we should do what we can to contribute to them. But I know that you are in the wildlife field because you believe that you are rendering a contribution, that you are undertaking a service to the country, and therefore that you will agree, even in these times of restraint, that besides the deficit and the national debt, we have a debt to the future. As a nation, our debt to the future is to see that we leave to our

descendants the bounty of species, the quality of the environment, and the stocks of resources that have enabled us to live as well as we do. We have an obligation not to short-change our descendants and therefore, when thinking of things that need to be done to put our financial house in order, we should always remember that there are obligations to invest in our future that simply cannot be overlooked or side-stepped.

A final word: while the fashions in politics and the conditions of economies change, and we have to react to such changes, the nature of ecological processes does not change. Ecological processes form the foundations upon which we exist, so we cannot ignore them despite the temptations brought about by political and economic change. It is in recognition of that truth that I hope we will be able to make progress in developing timely and useful conservation strategies.

"World conservation strategy" (2)

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

J.A. Keith (Canadian Wildlife Service) asked Dr. Munro if it was the intention, by the time of the 1986 conference, that Canada would be able to put on the table at least some draft provincial conservation strategies. What would Canada bring to that conference in terms of successes in implementing the strategy?

D. Munro (Canadian Wildlife Federation) said that he did not know who could speak for Canada in that respect. What he expected to happen was that there would be workshops at the conference where it would be appropriate for reports to be made by countries on the progress that they had made. In Canada he expected that there would be a statement from Environment Canada with respect to what had been done at the federal level, and he hoped that there would be statements and perhaps the tabling of documents as exhibits from as many provinces as were in a position to do so at that time. He said that he would be very surprised if all provinces had reached the stage where they could table substantive documents. Some might be in a position to table preliminary documents. He would be even more surprised if there had been an effective attempt to integrate the provincial and federal strategies into an overall national approach. That might come at some point, but he thought it would not be productive at this time to try to orchestrate that or force that sort of evolution. It had to take the course that it was on now.

Report (program highlights)

ALBERTA FISH AND WILDLIFE DIVISION

Wildlife Act revisions

Bill 84, a new Wildlife Act, was introduced and passed during last fall's sitting of the Legislature. It has yet to be proclaimed in total, although proclamation of sections respecting the Fish and Wildlife Trust Fund occurred on 5 February 1985.

Legislative counsel, departmental solicitors, and divisional staff are now preparing a new body of regulations consistent with the new statute. This task should be completed later this spring, at which time we will seek proclamation of the new act.

The new regulations will be packaged as follows:

- General regulations
- Fish and Wildlife Trust Fund regulations
- Game-hunting regulations
- Fur industry regulations
- Captivewildlife and exotic animal regulations
- Game-ranching regulations
- Problem wildlife regulations
- Dog-training regulations.

Waterfowl depredation and compensation

Two 5-year, cost-share agreements with the federal government were signed (early in 1984) to cover the period of April 1983 through March 1988. One agreement, which allows for payment of compensation to farmers for crop losses, increased the maximum payment for losses from $50/acre to $65/acre in 1983, and was amended to $70/acre for 1984. The damage-prevention agreement, which provides for the operation of lure sites (bait stations and lure crops) and scaring assistance to farmers, will facilitate both annual and long-term planning.

CWS accord

Preliminary discussions have dealt with minimizing the duplication of effort in some aspects of migratory bird management by both the federal and provincial wildlife agencies. Clarification of the roles and responsibilities of each of the two levels of government will lead to increased efficiency in planning and management by both agencies. Discussions are on-going with the identification of areas of responsibility being ironed out.

Information and education

The Public Information and Extension Branch prepared information relative to the division's functions to maximize public benefit from fish and wildlife resources.

Emphasis in 1984 was placed on promoting the new "Status report on fish and wildlife resources in Alberta".

A major 30-minute film on fishing in Alberta was completed in co-operation with CBC Edmonton. Assistance was given to the Alberta Forestry Association to successfully complete three short films. Television advertising productions on "Land access" and the "Outdoor observer" were aired with hockey star Lanny MacDonald.

Project WILD, a balanced program of activities for teaching about wildlife, expanded with six facilitators trained and manuals distributed in 10 workshops. A curriculum document entitled "The Alberta supplement" was produced as an aid to teachers in fitting WILD into their classrooms. A quarterly newsletter was initiated and distributed.

Wildlife Week activities expanded to include 4-H, Alberta Recreation and Parks, Junior Forest Warden leaders, Girl Guides, and Boy Scouts. Over 8000 kits were mailed to Alberta schools. The poster contest was upgraded to a non-competitive show to conform with Alberta Culture's guidelines on children's art events.

Promotional activities such as displays and public events were shared with the department's Information Centre and with the Alberta Fish and Game Association, Alberta Forest Service, CWS, and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

The "Alberta conservation and hunters' education program" involved 11 000 individuals, with 5000 students attending outdoor camps at Narrow Lake and Alford Lake. Over 700 volunteer instructors presented this program with a continuing effort to share more of the program with the private sector, particularly the Fish and Game Association.

Covert operations

Three plain-clothes operations were concluded during the past year. In the first, 78 individuals and companies were charged with 142 counts under the Fisheries and Wildlife acts for trafficking in fish (whitefish and walleye) and wildlife (moose and white-tailed deer).

In the second operation, six individuals were charged on counts of trafficking under the Wildlife Act. The items being bought and sold were bear galls and paws, and antlers of big-game animals (elk and deer).

The third operation involved trafficking of wildlife through taxidermists' shops and primarily involved trophy heads (mainly bighorn sheep) and birds.

"National Peregrine Falcon recovery plan"

The division, through chairmanship of the Western Raptor Technical Committee, has been responsible for co-ordinating the development of a "National (Anatum) Peregrine recovery plan". A draft plan has received initial endorsement from the Western Wildlife Directors and has been distributed to all directors for review and comment.

"Species in jeopardy" policy

A discussion paper respecting a "Policy for the management of wildlife species in jeopardy" has been developed. The paper outlines a system for designating species in jeopardy, identifies these in the Alberta context, and proposes general management priorities and strategies.

Game-farming

A policy paper, dealing with ways and means of retaining wildlife in captivity, has been developed. The paper describes various kinds of facilities for keeping wildlife in captivity, such as public zoos, private zoos, educational and research facilities, and big-game farms. The "Big-game ranching discussion paper" was written for public distribution and input. Most of those who responded to the paper favoured big-game ranching for Alberta. Many other people had serious reservations about the concept. A final decision on proposed new big-game ranching legislation is being delayed a year to better assess all possible ramifications, including public acceptance.

Wood buffalo reintroduction

Alberta Fish and Wildlife is jointly involved with CWS in a program to reintroduce the wood buffalo to their former range in the Hay-Zama area. During 1984-85, a total of 34 wood bison were moved from Elk Island National Park to a 3-km^2 fenced, holding area near Hay-Zama Lakes. The transplant herd will serve as the basis for establishment of a free-ranging population of wood bison in northwestern Alberta. The Dome Tha Indian Band is one of the main co-operators in the project.

Carnivore management

A draft, "Wolf management plan", a revised "Problem wildlife policy", and a historical review of "Wolf management and research and Alberta" were prepared. Kill rates of two wolf packs in western Alberta were determined. Grizzly bear mortalities during 1972-84 were summarized. Rabies in skunks and bats was monitored.

"Wetlands for tomorrow"

Nine of the 20 key wetlands identified in the agreement with Ducks Unlimited (DU) Canada are each being completed, and one is in the advanced stages of planning. An additional five projects are being initiated. A total of 355 ha of wetlands in the Big Hay, Kleskun, and Sterling lakes projects were purchased in 1984-85.

A committee structure and project approval process have been agreed to by Alberta Agriculture, Alberta Environment, Alberta Energy and Natural Resources (Public Lands Division), and DU Canada. This agreement is considered an integral step in expediting the wetland program.

Habitat development

The "Fisheries and wildlife habitat development programs" were consolidated in 1984 under the Habitat Branch, and 12 regional staff positions were reassigned to handle acceleration of the "Habitat development program", i.e. "Buck for Wildlife".

An increased emphasis on involving Alberta Fish and Game Association clubs in the "Buck for wildlife program" resulted in approximately 72 new projects.

Fish and Wildlife Trust Fund

Revision of the Wildlife Act resulted in the establishment of the Fish and Wildlife Trust Fund, which consolidated three programs into one trust but with separate accounts, i.e. "Buck for wildlife", Wildlife support, and Trappers' compensation.

A sum of $5.5 million was transferred into the trust fund--"Buck for wildlife program"--as a consequence of previous years' carry-overs, interest, and 1984-85 revenues. It is anticipated that $2.2 million will accrue to the fund each year from levies attached to hunting and fishing licences, as well as by the sale of seized articles.

Fur Institute of Canada

In July 1984 the Province of Alberta and the Fur Institute of Canada signed a 5-year agreement respecting research and development of humane trapping systems. The program will be carried out at the Alberta Environmental Centre at Vegreville.

Fur management policy

A discussion paper respecting a "Fur management policy for Alberta" has been developed. A comprehensive set of recommendations is provided concerning the management of fur-bearers as well as the administration of the trapping industry.

Report (program highlights)

MANITOBA WILDLIFE BRANCH

Wildlife management programs

Wildlife education

CWS and the Manitoba Wildlife Branch, through a new interpretative program at Oak Hammock Marsh, reached record numbers of people and marked the beginning of an aggressive campaign to promote the area, while extending outdoor conservation education to schools. Approximately 45 000 people visited the marsh in 1984: an 8% increase over 1983. Through the "Destination Manitoba program", the branch received $133 000 to develop a visitors' information centre for the area: looped nature dykes are also being constructed so that visitors can take a walk through the marsh without retracing their steps. Newsletters and a new "Oak Hammock Marsh brochure" were released in 1984.

Staff continued to conduct tours of the Narcisse snake dens and attracted approximately 7000 visitors in 3 weeks during the spring emergence of red-sided garter snakes.

The 1984 National Wildlife Week program saw the establishment of a "National Wildlife Week working group", consisting of representatives of 10 wildlife agencies and special-interest groups. The annual poster and prose contest was expanded to include a doodle-poster competition, all of which attracted over 1800 entries. Winning entrants received their prizes from Natural Resources Minister Al Mackling at a formal presentation at the Winnipeg Centennial Library.

Under the "Wildlife conservation awards program", 11 awards were presented to Manitobans or organizations for their outstanding contributions towards wildlife conservation.

The Wildlife Branch once again co-operated with the Manitoba Registered Trappers' Association in a wild fur exhibit at the week-long "Festival du voyageur". The display attracted over 14 000 visitors.

A $1000 grant was provided to the Delta Waterfowl Research Station for hiring a tour guide to accommodate public demand.

Hunting programs

Sport-hunting remained popular in 1984-85. Big-game hunters enjoyed 263 500 recreation days, harvesting 1751 moose, 23 090 deer, 1038 elk, 1153 black bears, woodland caribou, and wolves. In 1984, 31 298 resident and 3748 non-resident migratory game-bird hunters took the opportunity to take to the fields and marshes, harvesting 215 340 ducks, 168 208 geese, and 689 of other species.

Several changes in hunting seasons were introduced in 1984 to enhance hunters' safety, reduce illegal harvest, increase big-game survival, and reduce vehicle-hunting abuse. Refuges 600 m wide along major roads were created in three areas of the province. The hunting dress regulation was amended to eliminate the requirements for a complete outer suit of white, but increased the blaze-orange

requirement. The use of all-terrain vehicles for purposes connected with hunting was prohibited or restricted in many areas of the province.

Amphibian and reptile harvesting

During the 2-week, 1984 red-sided garter snake harvest, 57 245 snakes were captured live and sold to dealers in the United States. A 2-month leopard frog harvest was also held in 1984: 5922 kg of leopard frogs were harvested, a substantial increase over the 1983 frog harvest.

Wild fur management

The value of wild fur harvested in Manitoba during 1984-85 was approximately $4.5 million, up $700 000 from the previous year. Although the number of trapping licences decreased to 15 000, improved fur prices and milder weather conditions contributed to an increased harvest value.

Policy and procedure directives to facilitate administration of the wild fur resource were completed and are currently being considered for approval. Policies and administrative procedures have not been revised for 30 years, consequently major revisions were necessary to update the administrative system to address contemporary issues.

Trappers' and public educational programs continued to increase: 11 fur schools were conducted for trappers, and public school presentations were made in co-operation with the Manitoba Registered Trappers' Association to approximately 8000 students. Five trapline officers, based in remote areas, were given a 4-week course on humane trapping methods and instructional techniques to facilitate the promotion of humane traps and trapping methods among many Manitobans of native ancestry dependent upon the fur resource for all or part of their earned income.

Development and testing of humane trapping devices increased substantially. Tramping Lake Field Station was used extensively during the winter to field-test the effectiveness and efficiency of approved humane traps. In addition, approximately 600 humane traps were supplied to professional trappers to obtain scientifically valid data on these devices under geographic, climatic, and species-selective circumstances. This information is required by the Fur Institute of Canada prior to final approval of a trapping system for any fur-bearing species.

A significant change in the fur programs' direction was implemented this year. During the 1970s the focus was on development programs to rejuvenate the primary fur industry. In the 1980s the emphasis changed to preservation and management programs in response to contemporary problems presented by society. To accommodate the change, the Manitoba Registered Trappers' Association accepted responsibility for development and implementation of the Special ARDA (Agricultural and Rural Development Act), while the department renewed a prominent role in the development of humane traps and trapping techniques, promotion thereof, and implementation of management programs orientated towards maintaining optimum fur-bearer populations.

Wildlife damage control

The department assisted beekeepers in preventing black-bear damage by removing problem bears from the vicinity of beehives yards. In spite of these efforts, bear damage to the yards resulted in compensation payments to beekeepers of $96 000. Scaring devices and repellents were used to protect crops from elk and deer damage. Intercept feeding was used to short-stop deer and elk with an alternate food source. In 1984-85 the intercept feeding program cost approximately $55 000. Compensation payments for deer, elk, and black-bear damage to farm crops, other than beehive yards, amounted to $186 000.

Crop damage due to waterfowl was light in 1984 due to dry conditions and early harvest. Program costs of $185 000 were shared equally between Manitoba and Canada.

"Wood bison re-establishment program"

In 1984-85 the captive wood bison herd near Waterhen increased from 33 to 61 animals. Eight calves born on site survived, Calgary Zoo donated two calves, and Metro Toronto Zoo donated 18 wood bison. The enclosure was expanded to the planned 2300 ha, and construction of the corral facility was completed. The bison experienced some difficulty in feeding due to adverse snow conditions and their previous acclimatization to zoo conditions. Nonetheless, they survived the winter in good condition.

In September 1984 the project was visited by HSH Prince Albert of Monaco, a patron of the Wood Bison Re-establishment Foundation Inc., which was established to provide support funding for Waterhen Wood Bison Ranches Ltd., a Waterhen Indian Band corporation. The herd will be allowed to increase, while plans are being made to implement the first release to the wild in 1987 to 1988 in an effort to meet the primary objective, to establish a wild herd of wood bison in Manitoba.

Habitat management programs

Wildlife habitat inventory

Inventory of moose habitat in the 152 000 km^2 Northern Flood Agreement area was completed during 1984-85, using colour-coded habitat maps produced by computer.

An inventory of deer habitat in agro-Manitoba was initiated in 1984-85. The objective is to quantify the amount of tree and shrub cover by game-hunting area over an area of approximately 100 000 km^2.

A pilot wetlands inventory study with CWS to assess the Landsat digital data's application to mapping small prairie wetlands and associated avian upland habitat was conducted. Recommendations will be provided in a project report stating potential application to operational inventory programs.

"Wildlife management area program"

Manitoba Regulation 187/84 added a net 17 346 ha of Crown lands to the provincial wildlife management area (WMA) base. Eleven new areas were established, and

additions were made to 12 existing units. Negotiations through the "Local government district land exchange program" returned a total of 9583 ha of WMA land to the local governments.

Development activities included boundary delineation, public access and facility enhancement, and numerous wildlife habitat management projects such as development of nesting cover, food plots, water control and supply, and various habitat manipulation activities.

"Wetland management program"

An agreement was signed with Ducks Unlimited (DU) to cost-share improvements to the water supply and regulation system for Oak Hammock Marsh Wildlife Management Area (WMA). This agreement will provide an improved water supply of spring water flows from Wavey Creek, as well as improved drainage through Dewar Drain and Parks Creek. Habitat improvement features include a major dyke dividing the large centre cell into two smaller basins and another 50 production islands.

Declaration of the Rat River WMA has provided a land base for a potential wetland development, and the province has been working closely with DU on a proposal for development. The potential development includes almost 3240 ha of burned peat land.

Mitigation for habitat destroyed in the construction of the Big Grass River floodway has resulted in the establishment of the Big Grass River unit of the Whitemud Watershed WMA.

In 1984 seven DU projects, involving 870 ha of Crown land, were reviewed and approved by the Wildlife Branch. Advisory committees for the Saskeram, Summerberry, and Oak Hammock projects met on a regular basis during the year to evaluate management plans and activities.

Three Wildlife Habitat Canada projects involving wetland habitats were authorized in Manitoba in co-operation with the province. The Kissock project involves acquisition of an existing DU project as well as a woodland area. The Akudlik project will emphasize water-level management and interpretative development in the Cape Churchill special conservation area for the rare Ross' Gull nesting area.

Deer and elk feeding

Early deep snows and freezing rains in western Manitoba prompted public requests to feed deer and elk through a $228 500 emergency feeding program.

With an estimated 900 volunteers, departmental staff fed approximately 12 000-15 000 deer and 500-700 elk in about 600-700 separate locations. Total expenditures were approximately $250 000, which included increased depredation prevention costs. An estimated 835 t of pelleted deer feed were purchased by the branch, with another 50 t purchased by other groups. Several hundred tonnes of hay were purchased and fed to deer and elk.

The Manitoba Wildlife Federation and local groups contributed heavily to the purchase of hay and feed. Many volunteers were associated with game and fish associations.

The emergency efforts probably saved 3000-4000 deer from death by starvation, and prevented severe damage to stored forage crops in western Manitoba.

"Manitoba habitat heritage program"

This habitat program was developed by the Fisheries and Wildlife branches in 1983-85. A projected budget of $1.5 million over 4 years is to be allocated among fish and wildlife habitat projects as follows: $250 000 in fiscal years 1984-85 and 1985-86 respectively, and $500 000 in 1986-87 and 1987-88 respectively. Wildlife habitat thrusts under this program in 1984-85 involved the purchase of two quarter-sections of prime upland habitat in southwestern Manitoba and small dam construction on the MacPhail Refuge, and on the Malaher and West Derby MWAs. Habitat for moose on Hecla Island was rejuvenated and some 100 Wood Duck nest boxes were purchased for placement by the "Greenwing Youth Club" of the Turtle Mountain DU Committee.

Road allowance program

A 35-mm slide presentation, entitled "Ribbons of habitat - Manitoba's undeveloped road allowances", was prepared to promote the preservation of wildlife habitat on unused municipal road allowances. This presentation was made to rural municipalities, the Manitoba Wildlife Federation, the Department of Agriculture, the La Verendrye and Turtle Mountain Wildlife Associations, and Department of Natural Resources field staff.

The Rural Municipality of Odanah passed a by-law prohibiting the destruction of vegetation on undeveloped allowances, and several other municipalities are contemplating similar action.

Land-use rationalization

The Wildlife Branch continued to provide inputs to land-use planning on patent lands by providing five planning districts with reports and recommendations on wildlife resources in their respective areas.

Inputs were also provided on Crown land-use planning through the Crown Land Classification Committee and representation on the Block Planning committees. In addition, over 240 specific Crown land-use requests were reviewed, as well as "Environmental impact statements" for the Limestone project and the Gillam to Churchill hydro corridor.

Oak Hammock Marsh

On 11 January 1985 the Province of Manitoba and DU signed a 10-year agreement that will provide $1.9 million towards the development of Oak Hammock Marsh. The improvements include construction of a diversion to channel additional water into Oak Hammock from Wavey Creek, improved drainage to quickly remove water, habitat improvements, and visitors' facility upgrading. The developments will augment marsh wildlife productivity, assist in controlling avian botulism outbreaks in the future, and enhance public viewing of wildlife.

Biological services

Canada Geese studies

Studies of the eastern prairie populations of Canada Geese continued with co-operative financial support from several wildlife agencies in the Mississippi Flyway and the US Fish and Wildlife Service. Over 1700 geese were live-trapped and banded in early August near Cape Churchill. Information gained will be used to aid in population management.

Spring nesting surveys of giant Canada Geese in the Lake Manitoba Narrows area revealed good nesting success with a relatively early hatch.

Waterfowl banding

In 1984 a total of 16 356 ducks were banded in Manitoba, as long-term evaluation of waterfowl hunting in the province continued.

Hunters' bag checks continued at traditional waterfowl staging areas, and information on harvest, hunters' numbers, and attitudes towards waterfowl seasons were gathered.

Bald Eagle surveys/transplants

Manitoba supplied 10 young Bald Eagles to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service in 1984 as our commitment to a 3-year agreement. The eaglets were released in New Jersey as part of a restocking program for the northeastern United States. In 1984 over 130 active Bald Eagle nests were found during nesting surveys in the Whiteshell, Interlake, and northwest.

Big-game surveys

Aerial surveys of the moose population in the Northern Flood Agreement area were completed in the last quarter of 1984-85. The densities of moose varied considerably within the area, with some pockets of habitat in which moose were abundant, and many areas in which the habitat appeared to be capable of holding many more moose than were seen. On-going consultation with communities will be orientated towards protecting areas of high density, while attempting to increase the density in depleted areas.

Deer surveys were flown in three portions of southwestern Manitoba. Preliminary analysis indicates that there are significant differences in abundance among the areas.

Elk surveys were not flown in 1984-85, in order to allocate a large portion of available resources to deer surveys, which had not been conducted for several years because of unsuitable snow conditions.

Biometrics

Two simulation models were completed in 1984-85: version 3.0 of the "General ungulate model" and "Polarpop", a model for short-term forecasting of changes in polar-bear populations. Modelling work is continuing on a co-operative basis, with the objective of integrating the two existing models, and providing software which will allow us to simulate population dynamics more precisely.

Rare and endangered species

Seven Peregrine Falcons were raised and released from Mary Speechly Hall at the University of Manitoba in July and August of 1984.

In the summer of 1984, 28 adult and juvenile Great Gray Owls were radio-marked as part of a 4-year habitat use, movement, and population dynamics study.

Photographs of Manitoba's American White Pelican colonies revealed more than 20 000 nests in 1984.

Monitoring of leopard-frog and garter-snake populations revealed that leopard-frog populations are reaching commercially exploitable levels. Garter-snake populations remain stable in unexploited areas.

Report (program highlights)

NEW BRUNSWICK DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Habitat management

Forest lands

The Crown Lands and Forests Act requires that wildlife habitat on forested lands be managed for the maintenance of wildlife populations. An interim habitat management strategy is to regulate the size and spacing of clear-cuts and to prescribe treatments to site-specific habitats, such as deer-wintering areas and watercourse buffer zones. Industrial operating plans are assessed relative to adherence to habitat management guidelines.

Work is being directed towards a system for habitat quantification and modelling. Such a system will assess the impact of alternative forest harvest scheduling strategies on the habitat and populations of New Brunswick wildlife species. Its application would be in development and evaluation of Crown licence management and operating plans.

Wetlands

Ducks Unlimited (DU) Canada has completed 77 projects involving nearly 7123 ha in New Brunswick. Discussions on the possible renewal of the 1981 agreement between the Province of New Brunswick and DU Canada and its implementation are planned for 1985.

Population management and use

Harvests of big game, small game, and fur-bearers are regulated to ensure sustained yields, acceptable success rates, and the quality of the experience. Hunters are required to register deer, moose, and bear killed in the province. Through registration, and at biological data collection stations for deer and moose, information on the size and structure of harvests is available. Data are employed in population modelling exercises for deer. Similar modelling exercises for moose are scheduled for 1985.

The Bald Eagle, Peregrine Falcon, Osprey, lynx, and eastern cougar are designated by regulation as endangered in New Brunswick. Evidence shows that Bald Eagle and Osprey populations are self-sustaining. CWS and Parks Canada are co-operating in a program to re-establish a breeding population of Peregrine Falcons. Management actions that would increase the capability of habitat to sustain lynx numbers have not been identified. CWS has maintained a file of sighting reports of eastern courgars.

The NB Department of Agriculture and Rural Development and Department of Natural Resources have established a Committee on Wildlife Damage to Agriculture. The basic purpose of the committee is to define problems and propose actions. Recommendations relating to coyote/sheep conflicts are now being considered.

Licences and harvests

A summary of 1984 licence sales and harvest information for big game, small game and fur-bearers follows.

Big game

	Licences	Harvests
Moose	5 053	1 616
Deer	114 000	26 000
Deer - bow	1 143	67
Bear	3 584	859
Bear - bow	73	12

Small game

Nearly 135 000 individuals were licensed to hunt small game: grouse, hares, and migratory birds. An estimated 565 000 grouse and 400 000 hares were taken.

Fur-bearers

Approximately 3600 trappers exported the following numbers of pelts during the 1984-85 season:

Species	Pelts exported	
Beaver	10 356	
Bobcat	537	
Coyote	1 132	
Fisher	247	
Marten	3 109	
Mink	3 003	
Muskrat	19 932	(fall season only)
Otter	528	
Racoon	3 867	
Red fox	3 376	
Skunk	116	
Squirrel	682	
Weasel	1 833	

Other activities

Protection

Approximately 125 staff-years are spent to control the unauthorized harvest and use of fish and wildlife resources. Enforcement and public education efforts are designed to secure an acceptable rate of compliance with all wildlife laws and to limit the number of major violations. The total number of known offences during 1984-85 was 1209.

Research

Financial and other support to the University of New Brunswick for research on the dynamics of New Brunswick's moose population was provided in 1984. The study focuses on the impact of hunting and the application of regulations to achieve population objectives for improved public benefits. A further component is directed towards the level and causes of calf mortality in order to identify subsequent management actions that might be appropriate. Staff assistance to the Humane Trap Research and Development Committee of the Fur Institute of Canada was given in 1984.

Hunters' educational program

Hunters who are 14 or 15 years of age are required to complete successfully a hunters' educational course. The course is presented by Department of Natural Resources personnel and by volunteers from various organizations. The manual used in the program is published by Outdoor Empire Publishing, Inc. and contents are approved by the North American Association of Hunter Safety Co-ordinators. In 1984, nearly 130 courses were given and 2424 students were gradulated.

Trappers' educational program

The NB Trappers' Association, in co-operation with the Department of Natural Resources, has essentially completed the development of a trappers' educational manual. It is expected that a trappers' educational course may become mandatory for first-time trappers. Details on the implementation of such a requirement will be developed in the upcoming year.

Fish and Wildlife Advisory Board

The Government of New Brunswick has made a commitment to establish a Fish and Wildlife Advisory Board to the Minister of Natural Resources. It is envisioned that a board would provide a mechanism for consultation on the full range of management issues and a means of communication, so that the Department might better understand the demands of citizens and that they might be better informed on management programs. The structure and function of the advisory board will be defined, and it is expected that the board will be in operation in 1985.

Report (program highlights)

NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR WILDLIFE DIVISION

Pilot test of new census for moose and caribou

In early 1985, a mark-recapture technique was applied to moose and caribou censusing. The random block counts using helicopters have become very expensive in recent years. The new technique, it is hoped, will provide a more accurate and economical method of population estimation.

Animals are spray-painted from a helicopter, then the ratio of painted to unpainted animals is compared at a later date. Early results look promising, but the economy of the method requires further evaluation.

Impact of hydro-electric project on caribou

In 1985 a 6-year study of the impact of the Upper Salmon hydro project on the Grey River caribou herd has reached its final year. The study showed:

(1) that animals avoided the site to some degree during the construction phase;

(2) that short-term mitigation measures helped reduce negative impacts during the construction phase;

(3) that animals are reusing the site since construction stopped, much as they used it before the project.

The value of long-term mitigative measures built into the project are undetermined so far, as are the long-term effects of the project, notably those associated with access.

Moose and caribou population trends

In Newfoundland both moose and caribou populations are increasing. We now estimate that the Island populations are 70 000 and 40 000 respectively. We believe both figures are conservative. Licence quotas have been increased for the second year in a row.

In Labrador the moose population is expanding slowly, but the George River caribou herd is increasing at an incredible rate of 35 000-40 000 animals per year. The herd, which is now over 500 000, is expanding its range south in Labrador to previously unoccupied areas.

George River caribou herd harvest strategies

Until 1984 only Labrador residents could harvest Labrador caribou. Now hunting by non-residents using outfitters will be possible. Caribou of the George River caribou herd can be taken in this manner during 1985. As well, a small-scale

(500 animals) commercial harvest by local residents will be piloted this year, with the distribution of meat being confined to Labrador. It is hoped that eventually such meat will be retailed throughout the province and perhaps the rest of Canada.

Impact assessment of low-level military flying

Planning for a study to assess the impact, if any, of NATO low-level flight training exercises on caribou and other wildlife has been completed. With funding under a Federal-Provincial Regional Development Agreement for Coastal Labrador, this program will commence in the summer.

Black bears

As part of recent caribou population studies, it was determined that bears are significant predators of young and adult caribou. In a separate telemetry study on moose in another area, it was found that they also take substantial numbers of moose calves and the occasional adult moose.

Concurrently with these findings, we are trying to elevate the status of black bears as a legitimate big-game animal. Until very recently there has been little interest in hunting bears; they are viewed by too many people as little more than a nuisance animal.

Caribou parasites

Elaphostrongylus cervi, a nematode that attacks the nervous system of Scandinavian reindeer and moose, has been found in all herds of Newfoundland caribou. Infection rates in feces range from 30% to 80% in different herds. So far there is no evidence that the parasite is causing any serious level of mortality or debilitation in any of the herds.

Non-game programs

A biologist has been designated to be in charge of non-game matters. The focus of work so far has been on Bald Eagles and Piping Plovers. In the summer of 1985 he will be making an initial attempt at determining the status of Peregrine Falcons in the province. He also represents this province on the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) and the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada (COSEWIC).

Ptarmigan and grouse hunters' survey

Ptarmigan and grouse hunters were polled to determine preferred hunting areas, regional differences in the intensity of hunting, and hunters' perceptions of game abundance. The results indicate marked differences between regions in the intensity of hunting, to the point where in some areas it may be acting as a limiting force. This will be tested further. After a number of years of very low bird population levels, some regions are reporting recovering trends.

Pine marten study

Pine marten are rare in Newfoundland and exist in an area where there is considerable interest in logging. A 2-year study in conjunction with the University of Maine to examine marten habitat was completed in 1984.

Studies will continue in his area as part of the environmental impact assessment of proposed logging activities by Corner Brook Pulp and Paper Co. Ltd.

Green paper on hunting

This is a document to solicit public input on various wildlife management topics, notably the big-game licensing process and various big-game management/harvest strategies. It should be available for distribution by mid-June 1985. About 30 000 copies will be distributed to a sample of last year's licence applicants.

Project WILD

This program is now known to most provinces. Newfoundland and Labrador is a subscribing member. A planning committee is being established now in order to run a pilot program in the fall of 1985.

Trappers' educational program

Over 20 workshops were held throughout Labrador to train new trappers in humane trapping techniques, pelt preparation, and marketing. A "Trappers' educational manual" is in production.

National Wildlife Week (NWW)

In addition to the usual activities--school mailing, exhibits, press release, etc.--a radio advertising campaign was attempted this year. A number of interesting wildlife facts were written for reading by children. Wildlife staff and co-operating radio stations then found readers and produced the tapes, and sponsor were drummed up in communities to pay for the air time. The numerous spin-off benefits of having so many people involved created widespread community support for NWW.

Big-game hunters' capability testing

It has been mandatory for new big-game hunters to pass a written examination and a shooting test since 1978. Now the testing process is being upgraded with a 50-page study guide and the use of life-size deer targets. Shooters will now have to hit the vital target area on the deer target to pass. This should reinforce the importance of making humane killing shots when in the field and help reduce crippling losses.

New enclosures at Salmonier Nature Park

Salmonier Nature Park is a wildlife educational centre displaying native species in large, near-natural enclosures situated along a nature-trail system. Five new enclosures--mink, muskrat, marten, ptarmigan, and kestrel--were started recently with federal assistance. During 1985 we hope to complete these enclosures as well as create an indoor small-mammal exhibit.

Operation SPORT - anti-poaching campaign

A toll-free, 24-hour, telephone number was established on a pilot basis in one area of the province in 1983. In the fall of 1984 the system was expanded to cover the entire province. In the first 5 months of operation over 200 reports of violations were received; 10 of these led to convictions with fines totalling $8000, and nine cases are pending. No reward is offered to callers regardless of the results of their reports.

Newsletter

In July 1984 the division published an internal newsletter known as "Antler points". This quarterly is an attempt to keep Wildlife Division staff in touch with each other on major wildlife issues.

New reserves

Public hearings on three new ecological reserves--two wetland sites and one internationally famous fossil site--were held in May. The management plans are reviewed at the hearings and modified as necessary. After that, full reserve status should follow by the fall of 1985. A major new wilderness area, "Baie du Nord", is well on its way to becoming a reserve. If it is finally declared, it will become the second wilderness reserve in the province.

Report (program highlights)

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES DEPARTMENT OF RENEWABLE RESOURCES

The Department of Renewable Resources has broad responsibility for wildlife management and environmental protection, powers transferred under certain sections of the Northwest Territories (NWT) Act. The department co-operates with federal departments and agencies involved in the broad spectrum of northern environmental and renewable resource management. In addition to enforcing the NWT Wildlife Act, departmental staff assist in enforcing and administering the Migratory Birds Convention Act and the Fisheries Act.

Renewable resources have traditionally been the backbone of the northern economy and culture. Industrial development, changing resource-use patterns, and political evolution have only served to highlight their importance. Northern residents depend, to a large degree, upon renewable resources, while Canadians generally consider the North, its wilderness and wildlife, as a national heritage.

Management of renewable resources in the Northwest Territories continues to be challenging in terms of the size of the territories as well as the number of high-profile species they contain. Various management initiatives have provided opportunities for joint consultation with the federal government (Indian and Northern Affairs Canada and Environment Canada), with the provincial governments, and with the Dene, Inuit, Inuvialuit, Métis, and non-native residents of the Northwest Territories, who place great value on preserving their traditional way of life.

Significant progress was made by the Department of Renewable Resources towards implementing the Western Arctic (Inuvialuit) Land Claims Settlement. The department is working with the Inuvialuit to put in place new environmental and wildlife management regimes that will reinforce the role of the Inuvialuit in renewable resources management in the western Arctic.

Wildlife population management

Gyrfalcons

Extensive Gyrfalcon surveys were conducted in the Kitikmeot and southern Baffin regions. Good productivity was observed in both areas, and 60 young Gyrfalcons were banded. A study into the food, behaviour, and dispersal of young Gyrfalcons was undertaken by a graduate student, with support from the department. Fall banding programs were undertaken in the Coppermine, Cambridge Bay, and Clyde River areas. A member of the Hunters' and Trappers' Association in the area was trained in the capture of Gyrfalcons and accompanied departmental staff.

A Gyrfalcon workshop was conducted in October in Yellowknife to review and discuss the objectives of the Gyrfalcon project. The workshop was attended by biologists from Alaska, Yukon, and the western provinces, and chaired by England. Workshop results were extremely useful in the preparation of the Canadian position regarding reclassification of the species to Appendix I of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES).

Caribou

Visual and photographic surveys were conducted on the Bathurst and Beverly caribou calving grounds. The results for the Beverly herd were similar to those obtained in 1982. The visual survey of the Bathurst herd indicated a possible increase; however, the analysis of the photographic survey has not been completed. A visual survey was also conducted of the Coats Island herd. The results from this survey indicate that the population is stable. Management plans are currently being developed for the Kaminuriak, Beverly, and Bathurst caribou herds. A radio-collaring project is being conducted in the Keewatin to study caribou movements between the Kaminuriak herd and caribou north of Wager Bay. The project has the support of Keewatin communities and the Beverly-Kaminuriak Caribou Management Board.

Muskox

Muskox quotas and management areas were reviewed, and a number of management zone boundary changes and quota increases resulted, including the addition of quotas for Tuktoyaktuk and the Keewatin coastal communities. A muskox tagging project, which was started on an experimental basis in 1983, continued this fall in the Cambridge Bay area.

Polar bear

The polar bear tagging project in northeastern Baffin Island was extended for an additional field season. A second tagging project was started in Foxe Basin in the fall. A telemetry study in the Beaufort Sea was conducted in co-operation with the US Fish and Wildlife Service. Results indicated that polar bears move freely between Alaska and Canada in the Beaufort Sea, and for the first time it has been demonstrated that bears den on multi-year ice 320-400 km offshore.

Wood bison

A survey of wood bison in the Mackenzie Bison Sanctuary and surrounding areas indicated that the population is still expanding outward from the sanctuary. Most recent population figures indicate a population of approximately 1300 animals.

Harvest studies

Attempts to secure funding for a territorial-wide harvest study have continued with the preparation of a joint submission to the federal Treasury Board by the Government of the NWT, Indian and North Affairs Canada, Environment Canada, and Fisheries and Oceans Canada in conjunction with native organizations. Harvest studies are presently being conducted in the Baffin, Keewatin, and Kitikmeot regions.

(continued)

Wildlife habitat management

A program to inventory important wildlife areas in the Northwest Territories has been implemented. The goal of this inventory program will be to generate a list of wildlife areas that will require some form of special management, as well as to assist the department in responding to non-renewable resource development and in fulfilling its role in land-use planning.

Satellite imagery is being used to classify and map habitat types in the Mackenzie Bison Sanctuary. This work is part of a general habitat survey of the area to determine forage production. Results will lead to a better understanding of the bison habitat resources in the area, and will contribute to the implementation of the Mackenzie Bison Management Plan. In addition, they will assist in the identification of new wood-bison habitat in consideration of potential transplant operations.

Reconnaissance surveys of wildlife resources were carried out in July 1984 on southern Baffin Island as part of the Northern Land-Use Information Series (NLUIS) mapping program. Information on the general distribution and abundance of wildlife in relation to habitat was documented and will appear on published maps in 1985-86.

The "Bear detection and deterrent research and training program" was continued in 1984-85. Considerable progress was made on the development of a training program, which will be ready for application in mid-1985. Rubber bullets, 12-gauge plastic slugs, and high frequency sounds were tested for their effectiveness as bear deterrents. Work was also conducted on the use of infra-red thermography for detecting polar bears near industrial sites.

Field services

Several assistance programs enable northern residents to continue to follow a life-style of living off the land. One of the main projects is the outpost camps program, for which 89 applications were approved, supporting 1342 people.

During the 1983-84 fur seasons, 3191 trappers sold fur worth $2 666 192. Fur-bearer management projects were undertaken in the Fort Smith and Inuvik regions. In the spring, beaver were transplanted into areas where the populations had been reduced by forest fires, excessive trapping, or disease. Fall aerial surveys in Fort Smith showed that there was a good population of beaver in the area. Studies of muskrat habitat continued to identify areas where water-level control would increase the muskrat populations.

We were actively involved with the pro-trapping programs of the Fur Institute of Canada. An exchange of information between the trappers and the Institute was established, and humane trap testing programs were started throughout the Northwest Territories. A trappers' training program is also being initiated.

The department released its first film, which was produced in conjunction with the Department of Information. "Koukdjuak crossing" describes the caribou tagging conducted on Baffin Island. A firearm safety students' manual was published. Along with the yearly production of the summary of sport-hunting regulations, many other pamphlets on wildlife and departmental activities were written.

Report (program highlights)

ONTARIO MINISTRY OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Co-operation with resource-users and shared responsibility continue to be stressed in Ontario.

National Wildlife Week

Each year, during National Wildlife Week in the beginning of April, staff members visit schools to talk to the students about wildlife and its value to our world and to our society. This year 20 000 young people were reached in this way. In addition to the kits provided by the Canadian Wildlife Federation, we produce our own promotional items for distribution: iron-on tee-shirt transfers, buttons, bookmarks, and this year self-adhesive stickers. The message we try to convey is that wildlife and wildlife-related activities such as viewing, photography, hunting, and trapping are integral parts of our life in Ontario.

Project WILD

In co-operation with the Canadian Wildlife Federation and the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Natural Resources' Wildlife Branch has committed an annual sum to the introduction of Project WILD in Ontario.

Project WILD is an inter-disciplinary, supplementary environmental and conservation educational program emphasizing wildlife. It does not replace any part of standard school curriculum. The goal of Project WILD is to assist learners of any age in developing awareness, knowledge, skills, and commitment for informed decisions, responsible behaviour, and constructive actions about wildlife and the environment upon which all life depends.

Project WILD was developed and tested in the United States, and 24 states are now using it with great success. The Canadian Wildlife Federation has "Canadianized" the elementary activity manual and made it available across Canada. In Ontario, introduction of Project WILD calls for the Ministry of Natural Resources and the Ministry of Education jointly to draw up plans for implementation. The first leaders' training workshop was held in southwestern Ontario in May.

Community Wildlife Involvement Program (CWIP)

This year Ontario expects to inaugurate a substantial program to involve interested persons and groups in wildlife management. Under the supervision of ministry staff, volunteers will construct, erect, and maintain bird-feeders and wildlife nesting structures; and create and manage wildlife habitat by seeding roadsides, trails, and log landings, cutting and planting for food and cover, and growing and planting wildlife shrubs for food and cover inback-yards and on other suitable sites.

Other projects will include bird-banding, and assisting at hunter-check stations and other information-collecting centres.

To help strengthen the relationship between landowners and recreationists, the volunteers will also undertake the development of habitat improvement plans for interested landowners, fence orchards against deer, and provide surveillance against poaching, trespass, and vandalism.

The Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters, the Federation of Ontario Naturalists, and the Ontario Trappers' Association will be involved from the outset. Projects involving inter-group efforts will be given priority in the program. Projects involving youth groups and landowners will also be encouraged.

Fur management

A new humane trapping regulation was passed in January to come into effect on 15 May 1985. A copy of the new regulation has been sent to each jurisdiction in Canada. It came about in response to joint suggestions made by the Ontario Trappers' Association and the Canadian Association for Humane Trapping to the Ministry of Natural Resources.

The textbook for the "Advanced trappers' educational course" is progressing well. Arrangements have been made with all the authors who are required to write the 79 chapters. As of 1 May, more than 30 draft manuscripts have been received. Illustrations of fur-bearers and pelt-priming patterns will be completed this summer. The pelt-priming illustrations are expected to take up about 100 pages in the final book. A trial "Advanced trappers' educational course" was held last August and another course is being planned for this fall.

An attractive poster-brochure depicting Ontario's fur-bearers and giving information on them was produced this year.

Hunters' education

The new "Hunter's guide", developed in co-operation with the Province of Alberta and the National Rifle Association of America, is available in English and French, and it has been very well received by students, instructors, and media in Ontario. An "Instructor's guide", to complement the "Hunter's guide", has been developed. The "Instructor's guide" should be available some time this year.

Wetlands

In 1984 the Ontario government released "Guidelines for wetlands management". These were to serve as guidelines to planning processes that would affect wetlands, the major ones being municipal plans. The guidelines provide that the Ontario government will supply information on wetland values from the wetland evaluation system developed with Environment Canada, and will comment on proposed uses of wetlands of provincial significance (wetland classes I and II of the evaluation system).

The Minister of Natural Resources invited all municipalities to comment upon the use of the guidelines and the concept that the guidelines may in future become a stronger policy statement of the Ontario government.

We have encountered some difficulties in that this is an early stage of a combined preliminary management and policy consultation process. Many people are concerned about possible effects of these measures, yet we are unable to advise them concerning all strategies the government will employ until the magnitude of the wetlands problem has been defined (i.e. how many wetlands require protection, how big they are, what means are acceptable, and how costly are mitigations of development).

The resolution of remaining issues will be approached through a comprehensive process of public consultation.

Wetland management

The Wildlife Branch is engaged in the 3rd year of wetland evaluation. Over 700 wetlands have been evaluated to date; of these 170 are classed as provincially or regionally significant. A provincial data base is being set up for storage and retrieval of these southern Ontario wetland data. Evaluation training courses were attended by 95 provincial and conservation authorities staff members in 1984.

Acid precipitation studies

Programs on the effect of wetland acidification on avian reproduction and the aquatic food chain have produced four journal articles. Wildlife Branch acid precipitation studies will be presented at the Muskoka International Conference on Acidic Precipitation in September of 1985.

Moose selective harvest in Ontario

The province implemented a comprehensive selective harvest program in 1983, directed towards rehabilitating the moose herds.

The selective harvest is working. The harvest has been limited to planned levels, and the percentage of cows in the harvest has been reduced from a high of 38% in 1982 to about 25% in 1984. The objective is to increase the herd to 160 000 animals by the year 2000, and to allow an annual harvest of 25 000.

Wild Turkey reintroduction program

Ontario initiated a Wild Turkey reintroduction program in 1984 in co-operation with sportsmen and other conservationists. Birds have been received from Missouri, Iowa, and Michigan, and have survived reasonably well. The program has strong public support, and more stockings in new sites are planned.

Good hunters' support for reduced Black Duck bag limits in 1984

In response to continental concerns over declining Black Duck numbers, Ontario reduced the daily bag limit for Black Ducks in 1984 from the previous six birds per day to one bird in the south and two in the north. The objective is to effect

a 25% decrease in harvest. Good hunters' support for the reduced bag limits was received.

Deer program

The current deer management strategy is entering its 6th year. The key component is the selective harvest system.

The provincial herd has responded well to the change in the management program. Hunters and other people in many areas are reporting that deer are becoming as numerous as in the "good old days" of the 1950s.

Black bear program

A new black bear management program has been developed and is expected to be implemented in 1986.

The program addresses issues such as licensing, hunting methods (baiting, use of dogs, etc.), nuisance bears, season dates, and ways to increase economic benefit from the use of bears.

"Habitat management guidelines"

"Habitat management guidelines" for use by government and industry foresters and biologists when preparing and evaluating forest harvesting plans are in preparation. The guidelines being prepared are for moose, white-tailed deer, caribou, fur-bearers, and forest-nesting and wetland-nesting birds. The guidelines for forest-nesting and wetland-nesting birds, as well as considering waterfowl, summarize reports that have been prepared under the "Non-game program" for heronries, Osprey, forest-nesting raptors, warblers, cavity-nesting birds, and bats.

Proposals (including wildlife-related submissions) to develop and demonstrate the concepts of integrated resource management are being considered for funding under the recent "Canada-Ontario forest resources development agreement".

Non-game

From 1977 through January 1985, the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources completed or commissioned a total of 23 status reports (10 on birds, five on reptiles, one on an insect, one on a mammal, and six on plants) on candidate endangered, threatened, or rare species; field studies were funded for 15 species to provide data for status assessments.

This is the largest number of status reports completed to date by any provincial or territorial government agency participating in the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada (COSEWIC).

Between 1977 and 1984, 85 Peregrine Falcons have been released to the wild: 58 released in Algonquin Park, 20 in the City of Toronto at three different locations, and seven in the Brockville district.

At the invitation of Canada Life Assurance Company, three peregrines were installed in a hack box on the side of the company's University Avenue building on 26 June 1984; four additional birds were installed on 18 July.

One peregrine release in 1984 from the Canada Life building returned (band # 5N5). The bird is a male. A second bird has been reported, but the sighting has not been confirmed.

Bald Eagle chicks from northwestern Ontario were provided to CWS courtesy of the ministry for release projects at Long Point. Dr. J. Grier, North Dakota State University, obtained the eaglets, and the Elsa Wild Animal Appeal of Canada provided funding for the project.

Significant financial and logistical contributions were made by the ministry to the "Ontario breeding bird atlas" sponsored by the Federation of Ontario Naturalists. In 1984, the ministry provided the following services free of charge to atlas volunteers: 20 air flights (Northern and Northwestern regions); use of ministry cabins or other accommodation in the Northwestern, Northern and Algonquin regions; use of ministry canoes in the Northern and Northwestern regions; and free camping in at least 17 provincial parks.

The regulation under the Endangered Species Act was amended in May of 1984 to protect the Peregrine Falcon (Falco peregrinus) as a species, instead of only the subspecies Falco peregrinus anatum.

A regulation made under the Game and Fish Act in June 1984 protects eight species or subspecies of turtles native to Ontario.

Rabies research

Until recently, research efforts centred on a bait designed to deliver rabies vaccine to the small intestine, anticipating the use of a killed virus (KV) vaccine. However, development of that vaccine was lagging, so the emphasis shifted to delivering "Modified live virus" (MLV) into the mouth. The liquid MLV vaccine must be smeared around inside the mouth. The bait consists of a 1-in. cube of sponge, dipped in a tallow-wax mixture and filled with vaccine. The cube is placed in an open plastic bag with 10 ml of fresh liver. Earlier experiments with a ground-meat bait showed acceptance by 48-74% of foxes on 500+ km^2 plots. In 1984, the sponge bait was dropped at the rate of 18 baits/km^2. It was accepted by 64% of the foxes. This was higher than anticipated, as most of us had predicted that a wax-covered sponge would be less attractive than ground beef.

Polar-bear study

In 1984, Ontario began its part of a major study of polar bears in Hudson Bay. Manitoba, the Northwest Territories, and CWS also stepped up activity, so that a co-ordinated study of the whole bay will be a reality.

The primary objective of the Ontario study is a mark-recapture estimate of the polar-bear population that uses the Hudson Bay coast. To that end, 200 bears were tagged; 31 adult females were also radio-collared, to enable tracking while

bears are feeding on the sea ice. Some of these were located over 200 km north of the Belcher Islands.

Deer study

Over 100 deer have now received radio-collars in two study areas--in Huronia (mixed farmland and forest) and the Loring area (forest)--with 18 does collared in each area in early 1984. Of those, 9/18 in Huronia are now dead, whereas 15/18 in Loring survived to December. All three deaths in Loring were due to legal hunting. In Huronia, two died in the hunt, and one wounded doe died soon after. However, one was poached, one died of rabies, one of unknown causes, and three were killed on roads.

Extensive studies at winter feeders are aimed at clarifying the value of supplementary feedings.

Long-term data set for deer

Data on deer kill and hunters' activity have been collected since 1954 in two townships in eastern Ontario. Analysis of this high-quality data set has begun to provide information and approaches directly useful to deer managers. Changes in the hunter's effort required to kill a deer turn out to be a reliable index to the deer-herd level. Multiple regression has allowed correction for weather during the hunt and several other variables. The effort data became especially interesting when selective harvesting was instituted. The effort to kill a buck did not change perceptibly until the herd level improved.

Analysis of the composition of the kill has yielded a graphic technique showing how the numbers of does killed per 100 km^2 will alter the kill of bucks 2 years in the future. This knowledge is fundamental to quota-setting for anterless permits under the selective harvest system.

Report (program highlights)

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND FISH AND WILDLIFE DIVISION

The program and activities of the Fish and Wildlife Division are directed at providing recreation and economic opportunities through the wise management and utilization of our wildlife and sport-fish resources. Conservation and protection are achieved through sound wildlife management and enforcement.

Interest and enjoyment in this renewable resource are shared by the majority of the population. In addition to the obvious importance of fish and wildlife to anglers, hunters, and trappers, a 1981 Canada-wide survey determined that 77% of Islanders surveyed enjoyed wildlife in non-consumptive, wildlife-related activities such as watching, feeding, studying, or photographing wildlife. The survey further determined that 78% felt it was important to maintain abundant wildlife populations.

Collectively, approximately 22 000 angling, hunting, and trapping licences are purchased annually. This figure does not represent the true participation of anglers and hunters due to a licence exemption for commercial fishermen and their wives, resident farmers, and farm labourers and their wives, and individuals under 16 years of age.

The reports that follow summarize projects and activities in major program areas of the Division.

Land acquisition

In 1984, the Fish and Wildlife Division acquired 45 ha of valued wetland habitat. This represented the first direct acquisition of land by the division since the discontinuation in 1982 of the Land Development Corporation land leakage program. Land acquired is managed for the benefit of fish and wildlife, and for the use and enjoyment by the public.

Fisheries

The division is responsible for the maintenance and management of 90 dam sites in the province. Fine grading, seeding, and the installation of protective railings at Carragher's Pond, Emyvale, completed the dam reconstruction initiated in 1983, jointly sponsored with Ducks Unlimited (DU) Canada. As well, the division assisted DU in the repair of the control structure and fishway at Larkin's Pond, Selkirk. Modifications were also undertaken to fishways at Bell's Pond, New Glasgow, and Bernard's Pond, French River.

In an effort to assess the use of fishways by sea-run trout and salmon, and to provide insight into the timing and strength of upstream movements, fishway trapping operations are carried out at selected sites on an annual basis. During the past year, upstream movements of fish were monitored with assistance from the Department of Fisheries and Oceans at Murphy's Pond, Millvale; Bell's Pond, New Glasgow; MacPherson's Pond, Flat River; and Knox's Pond, Montague.

In an effort to improve anglers' opportunities and increase recreational potential, the division co-operated with the Cardigan Fish Culture Station in the stocking of a number of areas across the province with trout fingerlings. Approximately 3000 brook trout, reared from wild trapped stock, were released in the Enmore River. Both O'Keefe's and Glenfinnan lakes received an increased number of rainbow fingerlings over the previous years--O'Keefe's was increased to 9000, while Glenfinnan received 5000. The Cardigan Fish Culture Station also provided rainbow trout fingerlings for stocking of two former borrow pits in the Bedford area of Queens County, as well as in the Clyde and the Dunk rivers.

The division co-operated with Fisheries and Oceans in its salmon enhancement program by making available Profit's Pond, Bloomfield, for semi-natural rearing of juvenile Atlantic salmon. These salmon will be allowed to migrate to salt water, as smolts, in the spring of 1985.

In an effort to improve Atlantic salmon management and to realize a more equitable sharing of the resources by anglers, a tagging system was introduced in 1984. As well, a reduction in the angling season was introduced as a conservation measure.

In the area of habitat improvement, several projects, sponsored under the federal government's Environment 2000 and Summer Canada Works programs, were given professional supervision by divisional personnel. Improvements were directed at the Miminegash, Little Miminegash, Indian, West, Goose, Boughton, Orwell, and Belle rivers.

Upland game

Woodlot management plans were developed for portions of Fish and Wildlife Division properties in Dromore and Westmoreland in co-operation with the province's Forestry Division, through a special employment program sponsored by the Department of Energy and Forestry. The management initiatives included the construction of access roads as well as silviculture techniques with a view to enhancing wildlife and wood fibre production.

The annual game harvest survey results were tabulated for the 1983-84 season, while the 1984-85 survey will be mailed out in late February 1985. Results obtained from this survey are essential to the management of game species and provide long-term population trends as reflected in harvest estimates. In addition, Ruffed Grouse wings and tails were collected from hunters and analyzed for sex and age to provide an estimate of reproductive success. Table 1 presents hunting harvest estimates for the last 10 years.

Although the provincial Korean Ring-necked Pheasant rearing program was discontinued in 1984, a co-operative pheasant rearing and release program initiated in 1983 with the PEI 4-H Council was continued in 1984. Eight 4-H Clubs were involved in the program with each group given 25 pheasants to rear and release; clubs were from: Sturgeon, Mashfield, Fort Augustus, Southport, North River, Freetown, New Annan, and O'Leary. Survival for released birds will be assessed in spring, 1985.

Table 1: Game harvest estimates for 1974-84

Year	Licences issued		Native wildlife			Migratory birds				
	Resident	Non-resident	Ruffed Grouse	Hungarian Partridge	Snowshoe hare	Snipe	Woodcock	Black Ducks	Other ducks	Canada Geese
1974-75	5426	194	7 640	1425	20 217	1125	137	15 876	16 480	9 400
1975-76	5680	248	12 239	2102	25 000	1153	694	17 370	12 280	7 574
1976-77	6316	268	16 841	3670	32 903	722	636	20 629	15 317	21 083
1977-78	6697	414	9 290	3450	29 940	360	380	15 690	12 360	16 770
1978-79	6848	439	7 870	2330	51 510	1363	286	20 490	13 680	11 756
1979-80	6261	364	6 625	1800	33 550	1360	30	13 390	10 980	12 670
1980-81	5864	413	9 740	3100	22 320	780	150	22 690	14 110	18 310
1981-82	5683	486	8 330	2130	18 860	1000	270	19 660	13 260	15 270
1982-83	5388	430	11 790	2260	17 440	600	32	19 290	13 120	15 290
1983-84	5800	493	12 100	2640	22 510	820	140	20 180	12 760	14 070

As in past years, the Earnscliffe Shooting Preserve was afforded technical and financial assistance in the operation of its pheasant rearing operation. This operation provides pheasant hunting opportunities for both residents and non-resident hunters under controlled conditions.

In response to a long-standing request from the Souris Wildlife Federation, a covey of Hungarian Partridge was successfully live-trapped from the Charlottetown area and released east of Souris. Further efforts will be made in the winter of 1984-85 to provide additional birds, with an objective of re-establishing a viable "Hun" population in this area of the province.

Waterfowl

The province renewed its commitment to wetland habitat management with the signing of a new 5-year plan with DU Canada. DU has been active in the province for the past 14 years and in co-operation with the Fish and Wildlife Division and private landowners has developed or undertaken improvements to 77 wetlands with a collective area approaching 2266 ha.

The division was involved in the enhancement of wetland areas in 1984, with the sowing of wild rice on newly flooded impoundments. As well, an assessment of previous plantings was conducted.

Through a newly signed agreement between the province and Environment Canada, the division and CWS will undertake wildlife programs in the province that are of national interest and will provide for the conservation of migratory birds.

The waterfowl breeding pair and brook survey continued during the past year. This survey, initiated in 1983, is based on the wetland inventory and provides an index to waterfowl production to be used in making regulatory management decisions. CWS co-operated in the survey by providing field personnel and assistance in data analysis.

Annually, the division is involved in banding waterfowl within the province. The Atlantic Flyway Council's Co-operative Banding Program provides information on harvest patterns and mortality rates for the various species of waterfowl in the Atlantic Flyway. The winter banding program resulted in the banding of 318 ducks comprising 303 Black Ducks, 7 Mallards, 7 Mallard x Black Duck hybrid, and 1 American Wigeon.

Efforts were also directed at banding spring migrant Canada Geese and locally produced ducks (Black Duck, Blue-winged and Green-winged Teal, American Wigeon, Pintail, and Wood Duck). A series of logistical problems resulted in only 24 geese being banded in 1984, while a total of 334 local ducks were banded during July and August. In addition, 38 Wood Ducks and 119 Black Ducks were banded in the Portage area, Prince County, during the fall in an attempt to determine the migration patterns for the large concentration of birds frequenting this area. CWS provided assistance in spring and summer banding.

The waterfowl program also includes activities related to migratory birds other than waterfowl: 42 young Ospreys and four Bald Eagles were banded in a continuing effort to gain information on migration patterns and mortality factors for young fledged from Island nest sites. This brings the total number banded in the province for both species to 171 and 21 respectively.

The breeding status of the American Woodcock, an important game-bird species in eastern North America, is conducted annually throughout its range. Results of Prince Edward Island's survey indicated an increase in the breeding index of 9.4% over 1983, despite a general decline the species is experiencing throughout its range.

A study to update information on the status of colonial bird species nesting in the western end of the province was provided with material and professional assistance. The study was carried out under the auspices of the federal government's "Environment 2000 program".

Fur-bearers

Divisional staff continued to monitor, develop, and improve the wild fur industry in the province through trappers' education, research, and management. The value of wild fur exported from the province for the 1983-84 season increased to approximately $197 000. This included beaver, muskrat, fox (red, silver and cross), racoon, wild mink, squirrel, weasel and skunk.

A phone survey of all licensed trappers in the province to obtain basic information about the resource-users produced information on the principal occupation and main source of income of trappers, the number and species of fur-bearers trapped by each, the geographical distribution of the harvest, average annual income from fur-trapping, and the numbers and types of traps used.

Although valuable for fur and, more important, for creating valuable wetland habitat, beaver populations must be properly managed to prevent over-population and subsequent damage to roads, woodlots, and agricultural land. Information on sex, age, and reproduction is collected annually from beaver harvested, and used in conjunction with population indices and harvest figures to determine annual trapping seasons. With a healthy, expanding population, the 1984-85 beaver season was adjusted to provide for an additional month of trapping.

During the year, Fish and Wildlife Division personnel continued to co-operate with Department of Transportation and Public Works personnel in the control of beavers at highway-stream intersections throughout the province.

The province continued to lend support to the Fur Institute of Canada and its objectives of promoting sound management of fur-bearers and improving markets for wild fur. The Fur Institute is an incorporated company created in response to the increased pressure by animal rights groups against the harvest of wild fur, an industry valued at approximately $600 million to the Canadian economy.

Hunters' safety

As a result of an amendment to the Fish and Game Protection Act, all first-time hunters and those under 16 years of age were required to show proof of successful completion of instruction in firearm safety before being permitted to hunt in the province, effective 1 September 1984. In support of the legislation, regulations were introduced requiring all hunters to be in possession of a "Firearm safety certificate" before going afield, with experienced hunters being issued certificate on proof of previous hunting experience. In excess of 8000 certificates were issued to resident and non-resident hunters.

In an effort to ensure that all those individuals requiring firearm safety instruction were afforded an opportunity to obtain the benefits of course instruction, 35 firearm safety courses were offered throughout the province in community schools, in the curriculum of some regional high schools, as well as through a number of weekend courses. A total of 738 experienced and first-time hunters registered for instruction, involving 18 volunteers and seven Fish and Wildlife staff, with a total of 695 graduating. The total number of individuals offered firearm safety instruction in the province since 1974 now numbers 3452. In March, the division, in co-operation with CFB Summerside, sponsored a successful weekend workshop for instructors, at CFB Summerside.

There were no hunting accidents recorded in 1984.

Enforcement

Enforcement in 1984 resulted in 41 violations (the lowest number in the past 5 years) being registered by enforcement staff under the various acts regulating the conservation and protection of fish and wildlife in the province.

Report (program highlights)

QUEBEC WILDLIFE BRANCH

Planning unit

As its name suggests, this unit, under the Director General, Wildlife, has horizontal responsibilities. In 1984-85, it concentrated its efforts on the preparation of a "Wildlife policy". This very general document proposes a new attitude and approaches to the conservation, utilization, and development of wildlife in Quebec.

A 5-year plan for research and development will serve as a guide to these activities, with increasing attention being given to the socio-economic aspects.

Policies for the recognition and funding of provincial wildlife organizations are currently under discussion. An official position should be announced in 1985-86.

Lastly, a primary concern of our department is to bring together the various organized systems for wildlife use--wildlife reserves, controlled exploitation zones (Zones d'exploitation controllée, or ZECs), and outfitting operations. As a guide to future activities, a development plan for wildlife areas is to be established early in 1985.

Office of the Co-ordinator for Indian and Inuit Affairs

This office is responsible for administering the hunting, fishing, and trapping provisions of the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement (CBJNQ) and the Northeastern Quebec Agreement (CNEQ). Further, it is equally concerned with matters relating to the hunting, fishing, and trapping rights of other native peoples who have not yet concluded specific agreements with Quebec. It also administers recreational programs in native communities.

In November 1984, the Attikamek-Montagnais Council (CAM) submitted its views to the Quebec Government on a specific hunting, fishing, and trapping plan. The Office of the Co-ordinator took part in the ensuing negotiations, which have since been suspended.

The Co-ordinator's office also took part in the following activities:

(1) Agreements on the gill-netting of Atlantic salmon in certain estuaries and rivers are renegotiated every year with the Restigouche Band Council (Ristigouche River), the CAM (Saint-Augustin, Romaine, and Escoumins rivers), the Natashquan Band Council (Natashquan River), and the Sept-Iles/Malioténam Band Council (Moisie River). Under the authority of the Secretariat for Governmental Activities in Indian and Unuit Affairs (SAGMAI), an agreement is being negotiated with the Labrador Inuit Association for a specific hunting, fishing, and trapping plan and management of the George River caribou herd.

(2) Guaranteed harvesting levels for Inuit were negotiated and established in February 1983. Guaranteed harvesting levels for the Cree are currently being negotiated.

(3) An experiment in marketing caribou meat has been devised and may be implemented in 1985.

(4) A contribution of $1 765 574 was made to the Kativik Regional Council under the support program for Inuit hunting, fishing, and trapping activities.

(5) A contribution of $102 411 was made to the Naskapi Band Council under the support program for their hunting, fishing, and trapping activities.

(6) A contribution of $67 097 was made to the Cree Trappers' Association for their trapping activities.

Ecological Studies Service

Reporting directly to the Director General, Wildlife, this service is responsible for ensuring the maintenance, improvement, and conservation of wildlife habitats. It is also responsible for co-ordinating impact assessments of provincial significance.

In 1984-85, the Wildlife Conservation and Development Act was passed. This legislation contains two new provisions: one to permit the creation of wildlife sanctuaries to protect endangered habitats, and the other to provide a basis for the conservation and restoration of various habitats.

We will propose in 1985-86 a regulatory framework for the protection of all essential habitats. Consultation will be broadened by holding a special meeting for all those concerned, including citizens, provincial agencies, those directly involved with the environment, etc.

In 1984-85 a preliminary inventory and mapping of essential habitats was conducted. In addition, two habitat conservation guides were completed, one for agricultural activities and the other for forestry operations.

We will establish a computerized data management and updating system in 1985-86. We will also establish a method for increasing the distribution of the two conservation guides.

In the past year the service was involved in several major efforts to assess the impacts, among other things, of spraying pesticides for spruce budworm and of diking the Lac Saint-Pierre flood-plains. In 1985-86 the service intends to play a role in the acid-rain issue.

Finally, several information pieces (brochures, advertisements, and TV material) were distributed to inform the public of the need to protect wildlife habitats.

Aquatic Fauna Division

Cold-water Species Service

This service is responsible for co-ordinating management and research activities relating to cold-water species, but particularly salmonids for the present.

In 1984 the service put its main effort into salmon research; a study was also conducted on the ability of brook trout to compete with other species, and on its reproductive behaviour in northern waters.

To monitor changes in salmon populations (Gaspé Peninsula, Anticosti Island, and the North Shore), young and adult salmon in three rivers were counted and some were tagged.

We continued our study to determine possible harvesting levels for salmon rivers along the North Shore, particularly those with native communities.

In conjunction with commercial salmon fishermen, we undertook projects to take breeding salmon and have them spawn and deposit their eggs and fry in streams that lack these fish. The adult salmon were subsequently reconditioned to produce more eggs, or to be caught for sport or food.

In addition, we continue to take part in salmon-related scientific and co-ordinating committees with the federal government and the Maritime Provinces.

Fresh-water Species Service

This service, which is responsible for co-ordinating management and research for fresh-water fish, played a major role in 1984 in reorganizing and improving the commercial fisheries management of inland waters in Quebec.

With the Wildlife Conservation and Development Act requiring the Department of Recreation, Game, and Fish to prepare a fisheries management plan, it was necessary to assemble current data on the various species sought by a number of users' groups, and to determine harvesting levels for them. This document was prepared in direct co-operation with the Quebec Department of Agriculture, Fisheries, and Food.

We also conducted the studies necessary to establish a tactical management plan for yellow pike.

We co-ordinate and take part in various research projects on aquatic fauna in Lac Saint-Pierre and on some inland reservoirs.

Aquacultural Service

With its responsibility to provide technical assistance for fish-rearing at government hatcheries, this service prepares fish production plans and sets the necessary technical standards and guidelines for fish-rearing.

In addition, the service conducts a disease-prevention program in government hatcheries--on the one hand to reduce fish mortality from disease, and on the other to study appropriate treatments for all fish diseases.

More specifically, in 1984-85 the Aquacultural Service conducted two projects to improve rearing techniques. One involves reconditioning Atlantic breeding salmon to increase their egg yields. The other is aimed at improving water oxygenation techniques with respect to water recirculation and fish transport.

We also took part in projects with commercial salmon fishermen to develop methods of keeping large salmon in captivity for spawning and subsequent reconditioning. It is for this purpose that the Baie-Trinité hatchery was set up.

Terrestrial Fauna Division

The following is a summary of achievements involving both big and small game:

- Development of a new policy on capturing animals and keeping them in captivity, with a view to adopting appropriate regulations;

- preparing a guide to the control of nuisance animals for use by field biologists in answering numerous complaints from the victims;

- establishing standards on how and when to use tranquilizers;

- revising hunting and trapping regulations for 1986-88;

- evaluating the hunting pressure and effort needed to harvest big and small game.

Big-game Service

This service is responsible for the management, development, and study of big game and their predators, as well as northern species such as muskox, polar bear, and the fresh-water (harbour) seal. The service's achievements in 1984-85 are summarized as follows:

- Continuing the provincial registration program for big game and their predators, and determining the ages of the animals harvested;

- preparing tactical plans for moose, white-tailed deer, black bear, wolf, muskox, fresh-water seal, and polar bear;

- developing content for the "Big-game management manual";

- preparing a moose management plan, monitoring moose harvest by sport hunters and conducting aerial-inventory programs, encouraging the non-hunting use of moose, evaluating the carrying capacity of the Gaspé Peninsula, identifying factors governing moose-wolf relationships, and determining the impact of a reduction in predators on moose populations;

- monitoring deer populations and identifying essential habitats through aerial-inventory programs, developing a system of indicators to monitor the status of

deer populations on Anticosti Island, and also a technique for inventorying their densities, and evaluating various harvesting strategies for deer populations on Anticosti Island;

- monitoring caribou in the LG-4 regions of Caniapiscau and Laforge, assessing the number of caribou in the Ford River calving area, and participating in the feasibility study for the marketing of caribou meat from the George River herd;

- monitoring black-bear harvests by sport hunters, and establishing abundance indexes by means of radio-active tagging;

- evaluating the effects of reduced wolf numbers on deer and beaver populations in the Papineau-Labelle reserve, and developing an indirect method of measuring wolf abundance;

- encouraging native people to participate in polar-bear management through a campaign to enlist their assistance in the collection of harvesting data;

- using telemetry to monitor muskoxen released in the Kuujjuaq region over the past few years;

- conducting a preliminary study of fresh-water seals in Lac des Loups Marins.

In the current year we are continuing our work on the development of indicators of population or harvesting levels, on predator-prey relationships, and on most species of big game.

Small-game Service

Through its responsibility for the management, development, and study of small game, fur-bearers, and avifauna, the service's major achievements for 1984-85 are summarized as follows:

- Developing a method of classifying habitats suitable for the nesting and rearing of American Woodcock in southern Quebec;

- preparing a socio-economic study on the effects of trapping hare with snares;

- implementing tactical plans for beaver, Canada lynx, and lagomorphs and snowshow hare, so as to identify the problems and priorities for projects on these species;

- conducting a study of population dynamics for Canada lynx, racoon, beaver, and American marten;

- preparing a guide on the processing of trappers' records, and also a management manual for fur-bearers in Quebec;

- implementing the trapping policy for fur-bearers in Quebec;

- participating with CWS in preparing a waterfowl management plan for Quebec;

- drafting a management plan for avifauna in Quebec;

- operating a Black-Duck banding station on Anticosti Island;

- continuing the program of tagging birds of prey in captivity to ensure improved control;

- planning the 5-year Peregrine Falcon inventory for 1985, and establishing a new release site for this species in Quebec;

- studying the avian and terrestrial fauna of Lac Sainte-Anne, following the implementation of a waterfowl management project by Ducks Unlimited;

- preparing guidelines for priorities in studies of competition between Black Duck and Mallard;

- reviewing the problems associated with hunting Snow Geese in the St. Lawrence Estuary;

- participating in the Ducks Unlimited project for management of Rivière-du-Loup Bay.

In the present year we are continuing our work on the dynamics of beaver, Canada lynx, and American marten, and on other species such as Black Duck, Snow Goose, and Peregrine Falcon. Lastly, we intend to play an active role in the development and establishment of a trappers' training course.

Wildlife Conservation Division

Biological Laboratory

The Biological Laboratory's main task is to provide authorities with scientific expertise to help clarify certain violations of wildlife conservation laws. The assistance of the laboratory is often sought by several police forces in Quebec for investigations associated with animal species.

Regional offices of the Wildlife Management and Harvesting Service and the various divisions of the Wildlife Branch also request the services of the laboratory.

The work conducted by the laboratory includes: identification of animal tissue and blood-stains, hair, birds or parts of birds, and fish or their scales; determination of the age of mammals from their incisors; and anatomical, radiological and toxicological examination of carcasses.

The laboratory is currently conducting research on the identification of wildlife species, the differentiation of individuals on the basis of blood-stains or muscles, and the analysis of blood-stains to determine their freshness. To this end, up-to-date analytical techniques such as iso-electric focalization and enzymatic protein analysis are used.

A research project to find means of distinguishing between wild and reared brook trout is also under way.

In 1984 the Biological Laboratory received 1060 samples. It also conducted frequent scientific exchanges with agencies engaged in similar work, such as the Canadian Society of Forensic Science and Northwestern and Southwestern Associations of Forensic Scientists.

Training and Prevention Service

By 31 August 1985, the service will have passed on useful information on avifauna and their management to a million youths between the ages of 6 and 17.

It is to design and develop, by 31 March 1986, appropriate courses and teaching materials for the following subjects: simple firearms, avifauna, terrestrial fauna, first-aid in the forest, boating safety, and survival in cold water.

By 1 April 1986, as part of PESCOF ("Educational program on wildlife protection and conservation"), the service will train 200 instructors at Duchesnay in subjects for which the Co-ordinating Committee has identified a need; and by the same date will retrain 500 regional instructors, and prepare the necessary documentation and materials for this training; train 200 recognized agents in wildlife management (ZECs, outfitters, and associations) at Duchesnay as part of the "Forma-faune program"; train at least 50 wildlife conservation officers as instructors at Duchesnay in retraining and upgrading programs for officers in the regions, according to needs identified by the Regional Operations Division; and prepare all officers in the regions for obtaining their first-aid certificates (expired cards).

By 30 November 1985, the service will offer the TACH ("Fish and game management techniques") program to the currently registered group of 50 wildlife conservation officers.

It will complete, by 1 April 1986, the certification program for 35 wildlife managers, so that they may qualify for the public administration certificate; and also the basic training program for wildlife conservation officers at Duchesnay.

By 1 October 1985, the service is to develop and establish the support and training program for wildlife conservation experts, designed to facilitate the work of managers.

Regulation and Licensing Service

In the regulatory field, this service is responsible for the simplification and rationalization of all departmental regulations affecting the wildlife sector. The handling of various requests for amendments to regulations and of the biennial regulatory review process call for constant effort by the staff. In addition, the service publishes information on regulations for the public.

The other field of activity involves the distribution and sale of the various hunting, fishing, trapping, scientific, and other licences through a network of about 2000 agents. In 1984-85, these agents sold approximately 750 000 sport-fishing licences and 400 000 sport-hunting licences. The service also issues the hunter's certificate, which is mandatory for obtaining certain hunting licences. The certificate can be obtained upon completion of a course on fire-

arms safety provided by the Quebec Wildlife Federation, an agency affiliated with the department.

Wildlife Areas Division

Wildlife Reserves and Refuges Service

Through this service, the department carries out a project for acquiring several private properties in the Rivière du Sud sector. This project is part of an agreement concluded with the Quebec Department of Agriculture, Fisheries, and Food for the protection of wildlife and their habitats on agricultural land.

In an effort to standardize, simplify, and update existing regulations, a general proposal is being prepared for a review of all regulations relating to wildlife reserves, and their consolidation into a single regulation.

To voice its concerns with regard to the impact of resorts on wildlife, the service made known the department's position on the residential resort development managed by the Quebec Department of Energy and Resources.

Further, the "reserve" status accorded to certain lands is currently under review. The Quebec Department of Recreation, Game, and Fish intends to reassess the existing management agency so as to find a more appropriate alternative, if need be.

Finally, two guides are currently being prepared: one is designed to assist regional directorates in drawing up master management plans for wildlife reserves; the other specifies the basic criteria for selecting wildlife reserves and the methods used in applying these criteria.

Delegated Management Service

This service is responsible for developing a network of 67 ZECs, especially by setting management policies and standards that call for the involvement of the users.

In 1984 the service was given the added responsibility of providing access to wildlife on private lands. The priority in this major issue is to counter the exclusiveness emerging in southern Quebec. This is why the service is negotiating with owners' organizations on opportunities for greater access to wildlife for non-owners.

A departmental solution was proposed to overcome the problem of providing accommodation in ZECs. This difficulty centres around the differing aims of the ZECs and the outfitting operations.

The service conducted a full review of background material for the "Forma-faune course" offered to delegated managers, which include registered associations for the management of wildlife in ZECs and outfitting operations.

The regulations for ZECs were reviewed in conjunction with the new ZEC Managers' Federation.

Finally, the service is establishing an information management system in support of the ZEC network. At the same time, steps have been taken to prepare progress reports within the network on its short-term development goals, following 8 years of operation.

Concessions and Business Service

This newly formed service is responsible for the development of outfitting operations. In this capacity it proposes management policies and standards applicable to the private sector. Operating on a non-regional basis, the service also handles general administrative operations such as lease and licence renewals, transfers, building permits, and extension of lands under lease, and the issue of new licences.

In 1984 the service began classifying outfitting operations with a view to establishing a "tourism profile" for each.

Preliminary regulatory reform was also undertaken following fairly substantial amendments to the legal status of outfitting operations.

An agreement was concluded with the Société de développement industriel to provide tourism loans for outfitting operations that qualify as small or medium-sized businesses.

Lastly, the service is establishing a management information system to assist outfitting operations. This system will also be used for the ZEC network, and should be extended to the wildlife reserves and sanctuaries as well.

arms safety provided by the Quebec Wildlife Federation, an agency affiliated with the department.

Wildlife Areas Division

Wildlife Reserves and Refuges Service

Through this service, the department carries out a project for acquiring several private properties in the Rivière du Sud sector. This project is part of an agreement concluded with the Quebec Department of Agriculture, Fisheries, and Food for the protection of wildlife and their habitats on agricultural land.

In an effort to standardize, simplify, and update existing regulations, a general proposal is being prepared for a review of all regulations relating to wildlife reserves, and their consolidation into a single regulation.

To voice its concerns with regard to the impact of resorts on wildlife, the service made known the department's position on the residential resort development managed by the Quebec Department of Energy and Resources.

Further, the "reserve" status accorded to certain lands is currently under review. The Quebec Department of Recreation, Game, and Fish intends to reassess the existing management agency so as to find a more appropriate alternative, if need be.

Finally, two guides are currently being prepared: one is designed to assist regional directorates in drawing up master management plans for wildlife reserves; the other specifies the basic criteria for selecting wildlife reserves and the methods used in applying these criteria.

Delegated Management Service

This service is responsible for developing a network of 67 ZECs, especially by setting management policies and standards that call for the involvement of the users.

In 1984 the service was given the added responsibility of providing access to wildlife on private lands. The priority in this major issue is to counter the exclusiveness emerging in southern Quebec. This is why the service is negotiating with owners' organizations on opportunities for greater access to wildlife for non-owners.

A departmental solution was proposed to overcome the problem of providing accommodation in ZECs. This difficulty centres around the differing aims of the ZECs and the outfitting operations.

The service conducted a full review of background material for the "Forma-faune course" offered to delegated managers, which include registered associations for the management of wildlife in ZECs and outfitting operations.

The regulations for ZECs were reviewed in conjunction with the new ZEC Managers' Federation.

Finally, the service is establishing an information management system in support of the ZEC network. At the same time, steps have been taken to prepare progress reports within the network on its short-term development goals, following 8 years of operation.

Concessions and Business Service

This newly formed service is responsible for the development of outfitting operations. In this capacity it proposes management policies and standards applicable to the private sector. Operating on a non-regional basis, the service also handles general administrative operations such as lease and licence renewals, transfers, building permits, and extension of lands under lease, and the issue of new licences.

In 1984 the service began classifying outfitting operations with a view to establishing a "tourism profile" for each.

Preliminary regulatory reform was also undertaken following fairly substantial amendments to the legal status of outfitting operations.

An agreement was concluded with the Société de développement industriel to provide tourism loans for outfitting operations that qualify as small or medium-sized businesses.

Lastly, the service is establishing a management information system to assist outfitting operations. This system will also be used for the ZEC network, and should be extended to the wildlife reserves and sanctuaries as well.

Report (program highlights)

SASKATCHEWAN WILDLIFE BRANCH

The Wildlife Branch has been re-organized into four divisions for Habitat, Regions, Problem Wildlife, and Population and Allocations. This report will identify the accomplishments of the branch by division.

Habitat

Wildlife Habitat Protection Act

This precedent-setting bill was passed by the Saskatchewan Legislature. It is believed to be the first of its kind in Canada. It prohibits the sale and restricts harmful alteration of Crown land designated as critical wildlife habitat, with 35 209 ha initially included in the act. At year's end, regulations were being drafted to prescribe how critical wildlife habitat lands could be used and to designate an additional 405 000 ha of land.

Farmstead program

Initiated in 1982, this program has evolved to its present state whereby landowners with abandoned farmsteads, beneficial to wildlife, on their property are canvassed by the local Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation members to have these farmsteads preserved. Our part of the program is to supply a sign recognizing the pioneer who developed the shelter and the landowner who agrees to maintain the farmstead in its present state.

Heritage Marshes

The majority of the land acquisition was completed at Foam Lake, the second "pearl" in what will become a long string of Heritage Marshes.

This agency co-operated with Ducks Unlimited (DU) and the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation in submitting a proposal to Habitat Canada to help fund the acquisition of private lands at another proposed Heritage Marsh at Horseshoe Lake near Yorkton. This proposal was approved and $288 000 was granted for this project.

Wildlife Development Fund

In 1984, another 1060 ha of habitat was purchased by the fund. The total held by the fund now stands at 29 000 ha. An increase in funding granted in 1984 took the fund from $366 000 allotted annually to $650 000.

Moose restoration program

With 50 forest harvesting roads closed in 1984, the total of such closures in the Saskatchewan commercial forest rose to 300. An exhaustive inventory of forest

roads was undertaken as a prelude to negotiations with forest harvesting companies for large-scale road closures. The road closures and game preserves instituted to date are producing recoveries in moose populations.

Regions

The primary function of this division is to act as an extension to the other three divisions.

Problem Wildlife

Wildlife damage/winter deer feeding

The severe and early winter conditions which began in mid-October 1984 were viewed as a potential cause of high levels of ungulate damage to agricultural produce and excessive winter mortality of deer. To alleviate the adverse effects of the prolonged cold temperatures and deep snow on these two parameters, both intercept and supplementary deer-feeding programs were implemented.

Through a combined effort involving one-third of the department's total staff and over 2200 volunteers (general public and wildlife interest groups) approximately 2100 feeding sites were operated throughout the province. About 4000 t of deer pellets and hay were purchased to feed an estimated 46 000 deer and 1000 elk. Supplemental feeding was restricted to approximately 196 000 km^2 of critical deer range, with intercept feeding carried out province-wide south of the forest fringe.

Preliminary analysis of the biological data indicates that the feeding program was extremely successful in reducing winter mortality to 5-15% of the deer population. Although the total number of wildlife damage claims increased in response to the severe winter (500), intercept or depredation feeding significantly reduced damage and kept compensation payments at acceptable levels. It is estimated that to operate the deer feeding program alone cost about $20 per deer. Based on annual revenues of $25 per hunting licence for 60 000 deer hunters ($1.5 million) and extensive public relations benefits, the department views deer feeding as a positive government program.

Waterfowl crop depredation

The prevention-orientated program continued to provide scare cannons, lure crops, and bait stations to divert waterfowl from private lands in problem areas. Costs are shared with Environment Canada under the terms of a 5-year agreement.

Problem beaver control

A new program to deal with large-scale beaver problems was continued in co-operation with rural municipalities. Drainage systems are surveyed to identify all beaver dams and trouble spots. Dams are blown, beaver-proof culverts installed, and expert trappers are sent in to reduce populations. Municipalities are responsible for obtaining landowners' permission for entry onto private land while department staff carry out the work.

Fur administration

New programs to improve trappers' education and develop alternatives to the leghold trap are underway in northern Saskatchewan. Revisions to the Fur Conservation Area program are being implemented to improve management and harvest of fur populations. The province is also working with the Fur Institute of Canada to improve humane trapping techniques.

Population and Allocations

Burrowing Owl

With the aid of the Saskatchewan Natural History Association, a concerted effort was made to gather all known nesting information about Burrowing Owls in Saskatchewan. From this information, potential Burrowing Owl habitat will be rated as good, fair, or poor, and in the near future an estimate of Saskatchewan's Burrowing Owl population will be possible.

Eagle transfer

For the second year, 12 Saskatchewan Bald Eagles were sent to Pennsylvania to aid in efforts to bolster the breeding population of Bald Eagles in the state. The eagles, captured as 3-6-week-old chicks in late June, were taken from nests along the Churchill River system in northern Saskatchewan.

Elk transplant

During the 1984-85 winter, elk captured in Elk Island National Park in Alberta were released in two areas of suitable elk habitat in Saskatchewan's commercial forest. The first release, totalling 39 animals, took place in the Nipawin Provincial Park in central Saskatchewan, and the second release of 31 animals occurred in the Bronson Provincial Forest in western Saskatchewan. Both releases bolstered existing low populations in good habitat.

Wildlife management zone revision

A revision of the system of wildlife management zones used to control sport hunting pressure on various wildlife species was implemented for the 1984 hunting seasons. The 76 wildlife management zones that replaced the previous 37 zones were based on the recently completed "Terrestrial wildlife habitat inventory", and identified key habitat units in which wildlife populations could be managed on a local basis. The new smaller zones will facilitate better allocation of the province's wildlife resources to sport hunters.

Indian Conservation Committee

In an attempt to involve Saskatchewan's treaty Indians in matters pertaining to wildlife conservation, the department established the Indian Conservation Committee early in 1985. This committee consists of 10 appointed treaty Indians

from across the province and two co-chairpersons, one from the Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations and one from Saskatchewan Parks and Renewable Resources. The committee's role is first to identify wildlife management issues that involve treaty Indians and then to work with the particular Indian bands affected by these matters. It is anticipated that involving the Indians directly in the management of Saskatchewan wildlife will constitute a positive step for the provincial wildlife resource.

Planning

The department is building on its "Wildlife action plan", adding detail on individual species plans for big game. In addition, we moved into an annual planning cycle. In February a work plan for 1985-86 was completed to guide operations in that year.

Farmer-landowner survey

Data from this extensive survey of farmers' attitudes has been analyzed and a draft report completed. The draft is currently being reviewed prior to publication.

Project WILD

We received approval from the Department of Education to introduce Project WILD to the Saskatchewan schools. Our park interpreters were trained and used the material with school groups. Further implementation was blocked by our inability to obtain manuals.

Geographic information system

We prepared a statement of need for a geographic information system in co-operation with the rest of the department. The department is currently reviewing costs and benefits of obtaining such a system.

Report (program highlights)

CANADIAN NATURE FEDERATION

Membership

Individual membership in the Canadian Nature Federation (CNF) showed a slight decrease during the year to about 19 000; however, there was a corresponding increase in active affiliates to 98 organizations representing a combined membership of 185 000. Over the year the federation successfully introduced a program for information exchange with affiliated groups, and by the end of the year there was a noticeable improvement in communication. Part of this effort is a regular newsletter about CNF activities written specifically for these groups, resulting, we believe, in an even stronger federation.

Although income was up 11% over 1983, expenses showed a greater increase (due in part to some unanticipated costs associated with the installation of a new in-house computer), with the final result being a loss on operations of almost $46 000.

The new computer has enabled the federation to provide better service to the membership and better internal reporting to management.

Publications

Our main publication continues to be "Nature Canada", produced quarterly. It is the only national nature magazine published in Canada. During the latter part of the year the magazine was redesigned and the new look has been very well received. Initial steps were taken to obtain funding for a fifth edition of the "Canadian conservation directory"--a prime source book listing organizations working in the environmental and related fields at the international, national, and local levels. We hope to publish the directory in 1985.

We are co-publishers of the "Canadian nature calendar", and are responsible for a unique series of Christmas cards featuring Canadian wildlife. In 1984 we continued our program of distributing limited-edition, nature art prints of paintings by Canadian artists.

Other on-going programs include a nation-wide photographic contest and the Nature Art Exhibition. That extremely popular travelling exhibit (co-sponsored with the National Museum of Natural Sciences) visits many centres across Canada, both large and small.

Nature Canada Bookshop

Our bookshop, which is based in Ottawa, serves the whole country by mail-order. It offers a wonderfully eclectic mixture of nature-orientated books and equipment. All proceeds from the bookshop are used to further our conservation activities.

Canadian nature tours

In co-operation with the Federation of Ontario Naturalists, the CNF offers members exciting opportunities to discover the many unspoilt corners of wild Canada. The tours include a wide range of experiences suitable for people with an equally wide range of skills and abilities.

Nature sanctuaries

The federation's Clifford E. Lee Nature Sanctuary, located near Edmonton, Alta., is an ecologically valuable site containing a wide variety of flora and fauna, and is now quite well equipped with signs, walkways, and facilities for visitors, and is very capably managed by a local committee of volunteers.

Our property at the entrance to Conrad's Island in Nova Scotia is proving to be a useful bargaining tool in our efforts to ensure that any development that takes place in that area is carried out in the most environmentally sound manner.

1984 Annual Conference

Once again the CNF was fortunate in having one of our affiliates, the Federation of British Columbia Naturalists, host our Annual Meeting and Conference. It was not only organized in a most professional manner, but the program, entitled "Our Pacific Province - The challenge of sharing and caring", was both exciting and involving. The field trips were truly a great experience and the setting, on the beautiful campus of the University of British Columbia, magnificent.

Staff

During 1984 the federation unfortunately lost two of its longest-serving senior staff members--Managing Director Peggy Heppes and Editor Arnet Sheppard. They have been replaced respectively by Cam Seccombe and Judy Lord.

Conservation program

Canada's wildlife and wild lands face numerous threats, while government fiscal restraint puts all the more responsibility on private conservation organizations.

The CNF continues its active involvement in issues ranging from protection of rare and endangered species to the fight against acid rain. Some highlights of the past year follow:

(1) Rare and endangered species and habitats. We were in touch with a large number of federal, provincial, and private agencies through our participation in the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada (COSEWIC) and the Canadian Council on Ecological Areas (CCEA).

This spring we made a submission to CWS regarding its role in the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES), and our concern about the nationwide loss of wetlands was presented to a December 1984 hearing of The Inquiry on Federal Water Policy.

(2) Wildlife management. Since we have had a keen interest in the programs of CWS for many years, we were shocked at the devastating staff cuts CWS has suffered under the new government. The federation has taken every opportunity to voice its strenuous objections to this unwarranted reduction in the federal wildlife conservation role.

The September 1984 drowning of 10 000 caribou in northern Quebec has been of continuing concern to us. We have not been satisfied with the facts in the case, and we will continue to press the provincial government for a public accounting on the issue.

In May we made a submission to the Royal Commission on Seals and the Sealing Industry in Canada, and we recently prepared a policy statement on game ranching.

(3) Parks and protected areas. We were delighted when many long years of effort by conservationists resulted in the establishment of the Northern Yukon National Park. The new park was announced last July by former Environment Minister Charles Caccia at the CNF's Annual Meeting in Vancouver.

Our Conservation Director, Gregg Sheehy, is serving as chairman of a new, nationwide committee working for the preservation of British Columbia's South Moresby Island area. Committee members David Suzuki, Robert Bateman, Andy Russell, and others have all agreed to lend their support to the campaign to stop the logging and establish a park. Dubbed "Canada's Galapagos", this threatened wilderness has aroused the concern of some 500 organizations and resulted in more than 500 000 names on petitions to the British Columbia government.

(4) Acid rain. A founding member of the Canadian Coalition on Acid Rain, we work with the coalition's excellent staff in the crucial effort to curb acid emissions. A recent major gain has been the federal government's commitment to significant auto-emission reductions.

(5) "Conservation report card". In March we completed the first edition of our "Conservation report card" on the provinces. Ontario ranked first and Manitoba last in this study, which evaluated the provinces' performances in nine different categories, including rare and endangered species, wildlife management, forest management, and provincial parks. Publication of the report card will be an annual event.

It has been a busy year for us, with some severe trials for Canada's wildlife and some good reasons for optimism.

Report (program highlights)

CANADIAN FEDERATION OF HUMANE SOCIETIES (CFHS)

J.H. Bandow
Executive Director

Since our last report to the 48th annual Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference, my predecessor, Neal Jotham, has resigned his position with the Canadian Federation of Humane Societies to accept the role of Co-ordinator, Humane Trapping, with CWS. For many years Neal has been very much in the forefront of calling for the development of more humane trapping systems.

Trapping

The trapping of fur-bearing animals remains very much a major priority of the CFHS. And, while we recognize and applaud the progress that has been made in the province of Ontario to further restrict the use of the leg-hold trap, we are obviously concerned that there appears to be very little progress in many other areas of the country.

While we have applauded the new regulations in Ontario, we have made additional recommendations to be considered by the Ontario Minister of Natural Resources to further reduce the use of the leg-hold trap. These are:

(1) that the ultimate objective be banning the use of the leg-hold trap entirely, and that in the interim the following steps be considered -

   (a) until humane traps are developed for fox, coyote, and wolf, that the leg-hold be replaced by a padded leg-hold trap manufactured to a standard at least equivalent to the existing "Woodstream" padded leg-hold trap,

   (b) that the said leg-hold trap for bobcat or lynx be prohibited entirely;

(2) that snares be not set for rabbits or red squirrel;

(3) that the "110 Conibear" trap be banned entirely, with the suggestion that the single spring is not sufficiently strong to humanely kill a muskrat or a mink;

(4) that all trap chains on leg-hold traps used on land should be attached to a spring, attached to a central pivot on the trap, in order to cushion the blow to a lunging animal;

(5) that all traps must be maintained in mechanically fit condition;

(6) that possession of an operative trap be restricted to licensed trappers, farmers, dealers, or collectors;

(7) that the sale of operative traps, other than box or cage-type devices, be restricted to licensed trappers, farmers, dealers, or collectors;

(8) that the Ministry of Natural Resources establish a trap exchange program to provide new modified "Conibear" traps as replacements for old "Conibear" traps and leg-hold traps.

Wolf kill in British Columbia

Once again the Canadian Federation of Humane Societies has protested at the on-going wolf control program in northeastern British Columbia. This has been an on-going protest, since the CFHS is not convinced that the scientific evidence presented justifies the steps taken by the province of British Columbia.

Since the Canadian Federation of Humane Societies must address all animal welfare issues, it is only able to direct part of its resources and energies towards wildlife-related concerns. We therefore continue to appreciate the opportunity to present our views to this conference.

Report (program highlights)

COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF ENDANGERED WILDLIFE IN CANADA (COSEWIC)

J.A. Keith
Chairperson

This is the eighth report of COSEWIC to the Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference. COSEWIC is mandated by this conference to determine the status in Canada of wild species whose future may be in doubt, and to release the information upon which the declaration of status is based.

Classification actions

COSEWIC, in its prime role, assigned status to 25 species and populations on 2 April 1985. Two species were withdrawn from consideration pending expected new information. Committee decisions, based on status reports and agreed status definitions, were as follows:

Rare:
- King Rail - small stable population of limited distribution,
- Prairie Warbler - small stable population of limited distribution,
- Humpback whale (North Atlantic population) - the small population is stable, there is no evidence of threats,
- Pugnose shiner - restricted range and numbers,
- Silver chub - restricted range and numbers,
- Brindled madtom - restricted range and numbers,
- Pugnose minnow - restricted range and numbers,
- Bigmouth shiner - restricted range and numbers,
- Central stoneroller - restricted range and numbers,
- Blackside topminnow - restricted range and numbers,
- Soapweek - small numbers, limited to two sites, no known threats,
- Dwarf hackberry - limited distribution but no known threats.

Threatened:
- Humpback whale (North Pacific population) - the small population has limited breeding areas and is threatened by human disturbance (a re-evaluation - no change in previously assigned status),
- Bluehearts - very restricted and reduced range and habitat, one population extirpated.

Endangered:
- Piping Plover - steadily declining numbers and continuing threats to habitat (a re-evaluation resulting in upgraded status),
- Right whale - low populations and reproductive rate (a re-evaluation - no change of status),
- Gravel chub - low numbers, no records of occurrence since 1958 (a re-evaluation - no change),
- Heart-leaved plantain - only one remaining site in Canada, species much reduced throughout its entire North American range,
- Prickly pear cactus (eastern population) - protected plants on a very limited area are still being damaged by trampling, digging and removal,

Water pennywort - Canadian distribution limited to two localities, one of which is threatened by development.

Extinct (declared on the basis of historical fact):

Longjaw cisco - none have been taken since 1960s,
Blue walleye - none have been taken since 1960s,
Sea mink - last seen about 1880,
Labrador Duck - last seen about 1875,
Great Auk - last seen about 1844,
Passenger Pigeon - last individual died in 1914.

Not in any category (status reports were reviewed and the species determined not to be rare, threatened, endangered, extirpated or extinct):

Merlin - widespread, increasing,
White whale (Beaufort Sea population) - healthy stocks, no threats.

Withdrawn-deferred (pending expected new information):

Spotted Owl,
Redside dace.

Table 1: COSEWIC actions up to April 1985

(classed by major biological groupings and status)

Category (status)	Birds	Mammals) (terrestrial)	Mammals (marine)	Fish	Plants	Amphibians, reptiles	Total
Rare	14	7	1	16	6	-	44
Threatened	6	3	1	1	9	-	20
Endangered	6	4	3	2	10	1	26
Extirpated	-	2	-	-	-	-	2
Extinct	3	2	-	2	-	-	7
Not in any category	7	7	1	1	1	-	17
Total	36	25	6	22	26	1	116

Other COSEWIC highlights

(1) COSEWIC has started to deal with known biological extinctions by accepting historical fact instead of spending money on status reports. This gives a more complete understanding of what has happened to Canadian wildlife through human actions in the last few centuries.

(2) COSEWIC has exhausted the funding of status-report writing so generously provided by World Wildlife Fund Canada during the past 6 years. A 3-year/60 species/$120 000 "Phase I completion budget" was outlined in last year's report by COSEWIC to this conference. A proposal for funding is under consideration by the government members.

(3) COSEWIC notes with gratitude the high productivity of the Fish and Marine Mammals Sub-committee under its Chairperson, Dr. Robert Campbell, Department of Fisheries and Oceans. Bob's energy and perseverance with his sub-committee has brought to our attention the unique problems of obtaining scientific information on an invisible resource that has many Canadian populations at or near the northern limit of their range.

(4) COSEWIC has made contact with a little-known organization, the Biological Survey of Canada. It was first proposed by the Entomological Society of Canada and is lodged in the National Museum of Natural Sciences. Only the terrestrial arthropods unit has become operational to date, but the conceptual basis includes all groups of organisms. COSEWIC notes that a fully activated Biological Survey would provide much information directly useful in determining the status of wild species.

(5) A draft "Protection manual" is being revised for adoption by COSEWIC.

(6) The assignment of status is done by consensus in most cases. When voting is necessary, COSEWIC has identified its voting members as follows:

Category	Votes
Provinces	10
Territories	2
Non-governmental organizations (NGOs)	3
Sub-committee chairpersons	6
Federal agencies (National Museums, Fisheries and Oceans, CWS, Parks)	4
Total	25 voting members

Report (highlights)

STATUS OF WATERFOWL, JUNE 1985

L. Métras
Populations and Surveys Division
Canadian Wildlife Service

Summary

Atlantic Region - This spring, conditions are better than last year. The "Breeding pair survey" for ducks indicated that the number of pairs has increased compared with 1984. Overall the Black Duck population is doing well, but more results from the same survey are still to be compiled. If there is no heavy rain or cold weather to come, the 1985 breeding success and survival should be very good.

Quebec Region - There was no major spring flooding in any part of the province, which should mean good water conditions for breeding ducks. In addition, mild spring weather in the south has been good for brood initiation. In the central part of Quebec, a new spring survey was done this year and indicated a good nesting season.

Ontario Region - Northern Ontario breeding conditions are largely unchanged compared with past years. In the Hudson Bay area, breeding conditions were slightly advanced, and that could increase the Canada Goose nesting success.

In southern Ontario, habitat conditions were a little dryer than in recent years and breeding success is average for Mallard, slightly down for Black Duck and Green-Winged Teal, and up for Wood Duck and Canada Goose. In general, it looks like a lower-than-average year for waterfowl nesting success in southern Ontario.

Prairie Region - Pond counts in the southern Prairies have increased by 75% compared with 1984 and 20% from the 10-year average. Still, habitat conditions remain poor and ducks have not come back in their full numbers. Preliminary results from this spring's co-operative survey show increased breeding Mallard populations in Canada and a decrease in the USA (Table 2).

Pacific Region - In this region, the breeding season was late this spring even though habitat conditions were good. This could result in a diminished production of the Barrow's Goldeneye. Breeding conditions for Canada Goose populations were normal.

Northern goose - breeding areas - Survey results are still incomplete. Preliminary data from the eastern Arctic indicate a second excellent season in a row. The percentage of young in the fall flight of Lesser and Greater Snow Geese, Atlantic Brant, and small races of Canada Geese will be lower than in 1984 because of the high proportion of new breeders resulting from 1984. Conditions in the Queen Maud Gulf area appear favourable for Ross' Geese and Lesser Snow Geese.

Canada Geese nesting in the Hudson Bay lowlands and Ungava are having a normal season. Birds breeding in the interior were able to start nesting approximately a week to 10 days earlier than those on the coast.

Limited information from the western Arctic indicates no major impediments to successful nesting except for a 1-week delay on Banks Island.

Overall, subject to change as the survey is complete, geese will have a slightly less successful year than in 1984, but still above normal.

Last year's hunting permit sales

Hunting permit sales nationwide declined in 1984-85, continuing the downward trend that started in 1979. The total permit sales, by zone within province, are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Hunting permit sales

Province	Zone	1983	1984
Nfld.	01	28 335	28 607
	02	2 642	2 702
PEI		5 898	5 525
NS	01	9 064	8 569
	02	4 404	4 327
NB	01	8 621	7 745
	02	4 137	3 741
Que.	01	52 859	50 980
	02	14 841	14 328
Ont.	01	38 194	38 796
	02	76 001	75 919
	03	25 374	25 806
Man.	01	33 304	28 850
	02	7 139	6 388
Sask.	01	17 854	14 658
	02	8 251	7 440
	03	19 278	15 662
Alta.	01	25 927	19 447
	02	35 815	32 270
BC	01	10 711	9 269
	02	13 459	12 623
NWT		750	850
Yukon		474	496
Total		443 332	414 958

Prairie Region waterfowl survey results

Some highlights of on-going co-operative waterfowl surveys are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Mallard breeding populations (in thousands)

Prov./state	Stratum	1985	1984	1983	1982	1981
Man.	36-40	227.8	183.7	337.2	389.4	350.9
	24	NA	139.7	250.3	275.0	445.6
	25	77.6	47.2	63.0	87.5	98.8
Sask.	31-35	1334.7	1396.3	1713.7	1944.4	1504.6
	21	NA	103.0	100.7	134.7	110.5
	22	NA	77.0	132.4	135.8	138.7
	23	NA	145.2	120.6	162.5	230.8
Alta. (south)	-	754.1	667.0	845.5	765.8	947.0
Alta. (north)	-	3217.3	3366.9	-	625.1	624.4
Mont.	-	152.I	189.4	230.0	323.5	245.8
N. Dak.	-	362.4	548.9	398.9	466.5	308.6
S. Dak.	-	310.1	334.4	314.9	291.6	186.7

Those readers who are not familiar with the stratum designation from the "Co-operative breeding group surveys" should be aware that the results shown in Table 2 cover all of the surveyed area except for the most northern areas, from which results are not yet available.

The results shown in Table 2 are preliminary, and for some strata the information was not yet available. This year the Mallard displacement seems to be reversed, and higher populations have been surveyed in the Canadian Prairies compared to the USA (Montana, Dakotas).

Black Duck regulations

It is still too early to evaluate the effects after only 1 year of application of the restrictive regulations on Black Duck hunting. Nevertheless, estimated Black Duck total kill in 1984 has increased slightly compared with 1983 data (Table 5).

Recent midwinter counts of Black Ducks

The US Fish and Wildlife Service co-ordinates surveys of waterfowl in midwinter. The results have been obtained for Black Ducks in the Atlantic Flyway in recent years (Table 3).

Table 3. Black Ducks

1979	264 200
1980	221 000
1981	301 400
1982	217 600
1983	170 200
1984	165 700
1985	145 900

Habitat Canada stamp

Starting in 1985, a $4.00 "Habitat conservation stamp" will have to be affixed to the "Migratory game bird hunting permit" to validate it. The amounts collected from the stamp sale will be dedicated to supporting the varied habitat conservation projects of Wildlife Habitat Canada, a private, non-profit organization.

Migratory game-bird harvest

Results of the national surveys of the migratory game-bird harvest are now available. The break-down of harvest by province is shown in Table 4. For some waterfowl species the status must be given as "unknown". Among these are Cinnamon Teal and eastern populations of Barrow's Goldeneye and Harlequin Duck.

Table 5 shows a comparison of kill for three major waterfowl species hunted in 1983 and 1984.

Table 4. Results of national migratory game-bird harvest surveys

Province	Ducks	Total geese	Snipe	Woodcock
Nfld.	115 469	14 980	21 873	-
PEI	34 972	13 330	2 311	817
NS	95 552	6 900	2 314	3 138
NB	68 855	3 090	3 303	8 522
Que.	439 800	74 211	28 916	37 279
Ont.	832 832	66 109	7 405	49 867
Man.	215 340	168 208	1 785	-
Sask.	258 285	170 158	1 655	121
Alta.	438 549	122 416	2 170	-
BC	173 727	18 442	3 704	-
NWT	11 453	1 487	-	-
Yukon	3 221	409	16	-
Total	2 688 061	659 751	75 457	99 747

(continued)

Table 5. Comparative kill for three major waterfowl hunted in Canada in 1983 and 1984

Province	Mallard		Black Duck		Canada Goose	
	1983	1984	1983	1984	1983	1984
Nfld.	1 138	811	29 713	26 760	13 672	13 584
PEI	1 013	747	24 125	23 189	15 694	13 331
NS	4 133	2 061	57 031	51 573	9 732	6 900
NB	2 528	1 628	31 007	33 391	7 543	3 090
Que.	87 107	66 849	101 908	107 624	37 465	24 220
Ont.	297 822	283 624	61 056	64 390	71 326	63 859
Man.	159 823	118 071	287	350	73 707	93 292
Sask.	285 792	181 682	-	-	125 524	93 641
Alta.	363 659	304 785	-	517	110 504	98 753
BC	121 613	89 916	-	-	15 565	15 849
NWT	3 956	7 516	-	-	-	-
Yukon	910	1 681	-	-	351	379
Total	1 329 494	1 059 371	305 127	307 794	481 083	369 428

Report (program highlights)

POLAR BEAR ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE (PBAC)

I. Stirling
Canadian Wildlife Service

The 1985 meeting was held on 23 June. Representatives from Quebec, Newfoundland, and the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs (DINA) were not present. The Inuvialuit Game Council and the Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) sent observers. Bob Bell was elected Chairman for a 3-year term.

A wide range of management and research problems were dealt with. Of particular interest are the following:

- two new drugs, or combinations of drugs, have been successfully tested for use on polar bears;

- research on deterrents is continuing and progress is being made on a projectile that can be fired from a 12-gauge shotgun;

- Northwest Territories has developed a training course for conservation officers as well as industry on handling problem bears;

- several modifications to the borders of the present polar-bear management zones were made on the basis of recent research results;

- two studies of baseline levels of toxic chemicals in polar bears were completed;

- an oil-spill contingency plan was completed;

- a summary of educational material on bears was begun to make the exchange of available information more efficient; and

- new population studies were initiated on the Ontario coast, Southampton Island, and the eastern Beaufort Sea.

The need to manage the shared polar bear population in the Beaufort Sea was discussed. Arrangements are under way for Canadian and American representatives to begin negotiations as soon as possible. The active participation of Alaskan and Canadian users' groups is regarded as essential.

Drafts of a federal-provincial agreement to co-ordinate the funding and participation of all adjacent jurisdictions in polar bear research in the Hudson Bay-Foxe-Basin area were circulated before the meeting. It was hoped that this agreement could be signed by all Ministers within the next few weeks. However, Quebec did not send a representative to the meeting, which left the present position of the province in doubt. This is most unfortunate because the active participation of Quebec in the management of polar bears in this area is essential to both the efficacy of this agreement and to meeting Canada's responsibilities under the International Polar Bear Agreement. The active interest in the federal-provincial agreement by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans was noted and appreciated.

The committee acknowledged, with keep appreciation, the many contributions of its previous Chairman of 3 years, Rich Goulden, who was unable to attend this year for health reasons.

Report (program highlights)

CANADIAN COMMITTEE ON UNGULATE MANAGEMENT (CCUM)

At the CCUM meeting on 23 June 1985, five members and three guests were present. The members present represented Ontario, Alberta, Yukon, Northwest Territories, and Nova Scotia.

No formal agenda was presented due to lack of response to the request for topics.

A discussion of ungulate ranching and wildlife farming resulted in a request for the session chairman to collect, collate, and distribute copies of legislation from each province and territory, along with overview comments on the legislation, relative to ungulate ranching in each jurisdiction.

Doug Hagan reported on Ontario's "Moose management selective harvest program". A side-benefit noted was the more selective and careful identification of target animals, which resulted in fewer hunters' fatalities.

Ontario's "Co-operative deer study" is looking at, among other things, the effectiveness of various artificial feeding schemes.

The "Slate Island caribou study" indicates high mortality in 1985, apparently due to over-utilization of available range.

Predator-prey

Hugh Monaghan reported on the predator-prey discussions of the Western Wildlife Directors' Meeting.

The recommendation from them was that any predator-control plan must be developed by a group including more than just researchers, and further, any program development must be based on:

(1) knowledge of information on the predator-prey relationhip,

(2) decision as to whether predator control is necessary and to what degree, or possible alternatives,

(3) provision of a very good public relations and public information program to obtain support before initiation.

The Western Provinces Managers' Meeting in Vancouver addressed the predator-prey program and identified action points needed to meet the program criteria. They recommended:

(1) good interprovincial exchange of information to prevent unnecessary duplication,

(2) ranking of research needs,

(3) ranking of public relations needs,

(4) and that interprovincial co-operative studies may not be as useful as shared information from specific area studies.

Brian Pelchat reported on the Yukon's "Predator control study".

It was noted that the "animal rights" groups were now gathering force and would no doubt be the next important opposition to wildlife management. Their approach would require different types of action and information to support management of wildlife.

Bob Bell raised the question of the committee's future. The consensus held that the terms of reference were too broad, specific target groups addressed ungulate programs, interest in the CCUM was dwindling, and it had outlived its usefulness.

Mr. Bell was asked to prepare a resolution recommending terminating the committee's activities.

Report (program highlights)

WORLD WILDLIFE FUND (WWF) CANADA

We keeply appreciate the support which made 1984 a record year for WWF Canada. The combined financial statements of WWF Canada and the WWF Foundation show that in 1984 we raised over $1 million and supported 95 wildlife projects across the country. This represents nearly three times the total funds raised by WWF Canada in 1981. On an international basis, the WWF family of 24 national organizations has doubled funds raised in the last 3 years.

At WWF Canada we believe our supporters deserve a trim, business-like organization that delivers donations efficiently and directly to projects in the field. To do this:

(1) we strictly maintain low fund-raising and administrative costs (only 10% of total funds raised in 1984), which are completely offset by earned income--that means every penny of donations is used for conservation;

(2) we employ a small professional staff who work with the advice and active help of a volunteer board representing senior members of the business community;

(3) we use funding by WWF to catalyze funding from other agencies; we estimate every dollar from WWF levers three dollars from other sources.

Purpose and activities

Our purpose is to conserve wild animals, plants, and habitats for their own sake and for the long-term benefit of mankind, and to implement the "World conservation strategy" (WCS) in Canada to attain the following objectives:

(1) maintenance of essential ecological processes and life-support systems;

(2) preservation of genetic diversity;

(3) sustainable utilization of species and ecosystems.

Activities are designed to:

- fund or help find funds for wildlife research, education, and action projects;

- use funding by WWF Canada as a catalyst to secure additional funding or assistance;

- co-ordinate WWF granting policies with those of other agencies;

- follow up on all projects to ensure that each achieves specific conservation results;

- assist decision-makers to formulate and implement sound conservation policies;

- provide students and the general public with scientifically sound information on Canadian wildlife concerns;

- bring conservation issues of international concern to the attention of Canadians, and issues of Canadian concern to the attention of the international community;

- co-operate with leading nature conservation groups in Canada, as well as internationally through IUCN.

Our priorities for funding are:

(1) wildlife species or habitats that are endangered, threatened, extirpated, or rare;

(2) wildlife species or populations that deserve special conservation action because of their significance as a natural resource;

(3) conservation concerns in the Canadian Arctic, an area identified for priority action by the WCS;

(4) international projects involving Canadian leadership or a Canadian conservation concern.

In all cases, the practical conservation achievement of every project must be clearly spelled out.

1984 conservation projects

Studies and other projects, at a total cost of $668 256, included the following.

Whales beneath the ice

- Beluga whale critical habitat study, arctic estuaries

- Bowhead whale critical habitat study, Isabella Bay, NWT

- Beluga whale marking and tagging study, Seal River, Man.

- Narwhal distribution and abundance study, Northwest Territories

- Narwhal discrete stock study, Pond Inlet, NWT

- Bowhead whaling study, Inuvik

- Bowhead whale utilization in the western Arctic

- Whales Beneath the Ice Steering Committee and translation costs

Carolinian Canada

- Population ecology of the tulip tree

- Conservation of the eastern spiny soft-shelled turtle

- Rehabilitation of sand dunes on Lake Erie
- Discovering the life-cycle of the Karner blue butterfly
- Determining ownership of priority natural areas
- Rare birds of the Carolinian zone
- Report of the Steering Committee on Significant Natural Areas
- Special edition of "Seasons" magazine featuring Carolinian zone
- Carolinian Canada Staff Co-ordination and Steering Committee

Wildlife and habitat

- The breeding birds of Colombia, South America
- Identification of blue whales off Baja, Mexico
- Protection of a tropical forest reserve in Colombia, South America
- International Conference on Wild Sheep and Mountain Goats
- Conservation of the St. Lucia Parrot, St. Lucia
- Protection of the Mediterranean monk seal
- Provision of Canadian expert to the International Moose Symposium, Uppsala, Sweden
- Provision of Canadian expert for shorebird conservation, Malaysia
- Provision of Canadian expert to assist wolf conservation, Portugal
- Development of a "British Columbia conservation strategy"
- Determining sex ratio of leatherback turtles
- "La Amistad National Park conservation program", Costa Rica
- Conservation of the giant panda, China
- Survey of wolves and ungulates in Jasper National Park, Alta.
- Monitoring unusually large winter migration of Great Gray Owls, Ontario
- Radio-tracking Great Gray Owls on breeding and wintering grounds, Manitoba
- Conservation of the Burrowing Owl, Manitoba
- Supplies for the Owl Rehabilitation Research Foundation, Ontario
- Special donations for the Owl Rehabilitation Research Foundation Endowment Fund, Ontario

- Census of unsurveyed White Pelican colonies, Manitoba

- Conservation and protection of the Ross' Gull in Churchill, Man.

- Determining the status of the mountain cottontail and white-tailed jackrabbit, British Columbia

- Canadian Council on Ecological Areas

- Census of the endangered sea otter, British Columbia

- "Comprehensive research and management plan for the endangered Greater Prairie Chicken", Wisconsin

- Development and testing of wetlands evaluation methods, Ontario

- Ecology of the beluga whale in the Churchill River, Man.

- "Management plan for the wolverine", Yukon Territory

- Population ecology of the North Atlantic right whale, New Brunswick

- Reintroducing the Trumpeter Swan in Cranberry Marsh, Ont.

- Investigation of habitat needs for grizzly bears in the Kananaskis area of Alberta

- Reintroduction of the endangered Peregrine Falcon, Ontario

- Support for the "James L. Baillie Birdathon", Ontario

- Population census and recommendations for conservation of the kangaroo rat, Saskatchewan

- White Pelican rescue project, Ontario

- Determining long-term wolf/prey relationships in Riding Mountain National Park, Man.

- Reintroducing the swift fox, Alberta and Saskatchewan

- Captive breeding of swift foxes for reintroduction into the wild, Alberta

- Assessing the importance of the Rock Ptarmigan as a food source for arctic peoples, Northwest Territories

- Printing data cards and field report cards for "Breeding bird atlas", Ontario

- Assessing the impact of all-terrain vehicles on the arctic tundra, Manitoba

- Conservation of the Piping Plover, Manitoba

- Effects of forest fire on woodland caribou, Manitoba

- COSEWIC (Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada) status reports on the Least Bittern, Eastern Screech Owl, paddlefish, aurora char, deep-water sculpin, water pennywort, Sharp-shinned Hawk, yellow mountain avens, red mulberry, lake sturgeon, green sturgeon, Victorin's water hemlock and Victorin's gentian, Illinois tick-trefoil, large twayblade, copper sucker, dense blazingstar, Tundrius Peregrine Falcon (update), silver shiner (update), small-flowered hemicarpha (sedge family), white-fringed orchid and pink milkwort

Educational projects

- Audio-visual system for educational programs at the Wildfowl Trust in Slimbridge, United Kingdom

- Development of tropical forest educational materials, South America

- Support for 'Marine turtle newsletter"

- Interpretative guides for Costa Rica national parks

- Development of conservation educational materials, Falkland Islands

- Presentation of "World charter for nature" bronze plaques to Canadian Minister of the Environment

- Educational film featuring the White Pelican, Saskatchewan

- WWF Canada educational project

- "Canadian wolf defenders' newsletter", Alberta

- Production and printing of poster concerning conservation of seabirds on the North Shore, Quebec

- Support of a summer student at the Wild Bird Clinic, Ontario

- WWF Canada support for Project WILD

- Support for an instructor in the wet laboratory at Sunbury Shores Arts and Nature Centre

- "Keith Ronald scholarship" recognizing Dr. Ronald's contribution to wildlife conservation

- Wetlands display for Tiffin Conservation Area, Ont.

Report (program highlights)

DUCKS UNLIMITED (DU) CANADA

1984 program

The 1984 DU Canada construction program can only be described as "very successful and of record proportions".

A total of 19 736 ha and 1261 shoreline km of new habitat were developed throughout Canada. Consistent with the policy to develop areas with the highest waterfowl production potential, most activity still focuses on the three Prairie Provinces. Ontario, however, is progressing rapidly in terms of project numbers and habitat acreage developed.

In Canada, 62 more project segments were worked on this year compared with 1983. A total of 430 segments were subject to new construction, improvements, or major repairs, while another 53 remain under construction. Of the projects completed, 191 new project segments were constructed within the construction season, 103 segments begun previously were made operational in 1984, and 68 segments begun in 1984 will be completed in the spring of 1985. Six projects were subject to major repairs and 62 were improved. In keeping with DU Canada policy of ensuring that its projects remain in good working condition, 545 maintenance activities and 100 minor repairs were carried out.

DU field staff surveyed 464 new project sites representing 57 494 ha, and 229 existing project locations representing 61 096 ha were surveyed for water licence purposes or for project improvement design.

The overall population of game ducks in North America in 1984 held steady at an estimated 79.7 million birds. This estimate by the US Fish and Wildlife Service confirms improvements over the 1981 and 1983 situation on a continent-wide basis. Within Canada, wide variations in climatic and habitat conditions did have a significant impact on populations.

The spring of 1984 saw a return to habitat conditions in the prairie and parkland regions approaching those of 1980. May ponds declined by 37% from 1983 and, as a result of hot, dry weather during the summer, July ponds decreased 44% from the previous year. Breeding-pair numbers in southern Alberta and southern Manitoba were the lowest recorded since surveys began in 1955. The breeding population in Saskatchewan also declined.

The major concern for western Canada was the very low numbers of breeding Mallards and Pintails. The latter species fell below an estimated 4 million breeding birds for the first time in the history of the survey. The Mallard continued a progressive downward decline, so that this year's breeding population in the prairie and parkland regions was 30% below the long-term average and 16% below 1983. Mallards were at an all-time low in both southern Alberta and southern Manitoba this year.

British Columbia had good summer habitat conditions resulting in an average fall flight. Ontario continued its recent series of above-average production years, while Quebec and the Atlantic Provinces produced average fall flights.

Biological field staff evaluated 2830 sites in 1984, with 1227 of these judged to have potential for development. An additional 602 potential project sites were worked on during the year, bringing the total number of potential projects worked on in 1984 to 1829, encompassing 627 285 ha of wetland.

Initial steps were taken late in the year to co-ordinate utilization of wetlands inventory data being gathered through the Landsat 5 satellite on behalf of DU, Inc.

Staff members of the biological services group developed a method to estimate broods accurately on large marshes with large amounts of interspersed cover. This break-through will greatly enhance our population estimating ability.

As of 31 December 1984, a total of 1 429 996 ha of wetlands and essential upland had been reserved and protected for future project development. DU Canada's achievement to date has been the investment of $216 173 000 to develop 746 228 ha and 23 644 shoreline km of waterfowl habitat.

1985 program

The official signing of a 10-year wetland development agreement with the Territorial Government of Yukon late in 1984 portends a very exciting year ahead on all fronts for DU Canada.

The Yukon Agreement is one of several arrangements signed with governments that are now adding an impetus to stewardship of waterfowl habitat. New joint thrusts will be undertaken with British Columbia, Alberta, and Saskatchewan under wetland agreements signed earlier. The Government of Manitoba has assured DU Canada that a Heritage Marsh agreement that will reserve 40 469 ha is imminent, while the Government of Nova Scotia has given notice that a revision of the first 5-year wetlands agreement is to be signed in the near future.

These joint understandings will definitely reflect on the scale of the DU Canada construction program in 1985. The area of new habitat to be developed is set at 20 946 ha.

Several of the 397 project segments under construction or to be improved during the year will be large, designated marshes under joint preservation agreements.

New DU Canada offices will be set up in Whitehorse, Yukon, and Timmins, Ont. to handle expanded activity in new regions.

Assessment of new marsh projects will continue to be given emphasis. A total of 2011 biological reconnaissances are planned along with 988 engineering reconnaisances.

Predictions for continued growth in voluntary contributors' support are most encouraging, as an expected 50 000 Canadians will become involved with 229 committees.

Appreciable progress in developing the "North American waterfowl management plan" is anticipated as the federal governments, provincial governments, and waterfowl conservation organizations collaborate to expedite the arrangement.

Table 1. 1984 program summary

Projects	BC	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Que.	Marit.	Total
Project segments[1] begun previously, completed 1984	8	57	4	12	15	2	5	103
New project segments completed	19	61	43	16	14	14	24	191
Project segments operational in spring 1985	13	15	4	21	12	-	3	68
Project improvements	4	11	6	31	1	4	5	62
Project alterations or major repairs	-	-	3	2	-	-	1	6
Project segments under construction	-	4	23	13	10	1	2	53
Total project segments worked on (excluding minor repairs or maintenances)	44	148	83	95	52	21	40	483
New habitat[2] developed (ha)	2026	3860	3682	3146	2637	2466	1919	19 736
New shoreline[3] developed (km)	138.5	310.5	274.4	216	115.2	47.6	159.5	1261.5
Maintenances	75	268	95	46	21	10	30	545
Minor repairs	1	28	45	17	1	4	4	100

1 A project segment is a single marsh or a discrete component of a wetlands complex that may be worked on from a construction or maintenance point of view as an independent unit.
2 New habitat developed includes upland region adjacent to developed marshes within the area controlled by DU by lease or reservation.
3 New shoreline developed includes shoreline or habitat at the maximum or full supply level (FSL) for water management.

Contributor Services

More volunteers will be active in Canada in 1985 to foster and develop increased support for DU Canada programs. Conservative predictions for growth include an increase of 72 committees for a total of 229 active committees by 31 December 1985. Contributors are expected to increase by about 8000 persons to 50 000, while 1985 donations should exceed $3.7 million.

There will be more new sponsor dinners organized in 1985 than existed in total in 1984. These events, to recognize the support of persons who donate $200 or more annually to Ducks Unlimited, are most likely to be introduced in Prince George, BC; Moose Jaw and Lloydminster, Sask.; Brandon, Man.; Kenora, London, and Cambridge, Ont.; and St. John, NB.

With more volunteer committees in action, it is reasonable to expect more supplementary fund-raising events such as benefit trap and skeet shoots. Numbers of Greenwings and Greenwing events should rise, and more young Canadians will learn about the value of waterfowl and wetlands.

David Brynaert of Ottawa, Ont. has been selected the "1985 DU Canada waterfowl art award" winner with his watercolour painting of Canada Geese entitled "Late migrants". Other well-known Canadian artists participating in the "1985 supplemental art print" program are Norman Kelly, Luke Raffin, David Heibert, Michael Dumas, Susan Menzies, and Donald Curley.

British Columbia

DU Canada staff in British Columbia are preparing for one of the most significant years of operation in that province. Construction on a total of 50 project segments is planned, which, by year's end, should provide 1417 ha of new waterfowl habitat. Of importance will be projects to enhance the estuarian marshes that are predominant in the province, and vital to migrating and breeding ducks.

One such estuarian marsh restoration project for 1985 will be in the Little Qualicum estuary on the east coast of Vancouver Island. An intertidal marsh that developed behind a gravel-beach spit, Little Qualicum is of critical importance to fall migrating ducks. DU Canada will remove a portion of an old logging road that now cuts across the marsh and interferes with intertidal circulation.

Stern Lake project in northern BC, 140 km west of Prince George, is another challenge to DU Canada. Planning for controlling water levels on the 170 ha shallow lake and sedge zone marsh has been an on-going exercise with the provincial Fish and Wildlife Branch. A weir will be installed to hold lake levels to 1.4 m and keep out coarse fish. The multi-use capabilities of the project are of major interest to Fish and Wildlife Branch officials, and could lead to collaboration on other important wetlands in the region.

Alberta

Another busy year is expected in Alberta in 1985, with 95 new projects planned that will contribute another 5100 ha of new waterfowl habitat totals, and 17 projects will be improved.

Mallard and Pintail productivity is expected to rise dramatically at the Aqueduct Marshes south of Brooks, once a joint project with the Eastern Irrigation District and the local fish and game association is in operation. The intent is to tie 16 semi-permanent potholes into a water source provided by excess irrigation water. Ditches and natural runways will carry the water from pothole to pothole or from the irrigation canal. Small water control structures will hold sufficient water in each wetland to ensure open water all summer long. The area of new habitat created is 120 ha and 18 km of shoreline.

Galahad Coulee project, 80 km southeast of Camrose, will provide 102 ha of new waterfowl habitat, plus 8 km of shoreline. With the construction of four dams at the outlet of each segment, four cattail-clogged wetlands within the coulee will be converted into open-water marshes with about 50% vegetation interspersion. Some agricultural benefits accrue from this project through backflooding of hayland in one segment.

Under the "Wetlands for tomorrow" program in conjunction with the Government of Alberta, Phase II of the Rush-Tyrell project will be started. Negotiations on land reservation on other marshes specified in the agreement will be continued.

Saskatchewan

The 1985 Saskatchewan habitat development program will include work on 41 projects representing the development of 7285 new ha of waterfowl habitat; 13 project improvements are also planned.

The 1822-ha Foam Lake Heritage Marsh project, located 5 km north of the town of Foam Lake, is scheduled for construction in 1985. Owing to severe fluctuations in water levels, Foam Lake has been under threat of total drainage for over 30 years. The signing of the Heritage Marsh Agreement provided wildlife agencies with the tools to secure this key production, moulting, and staging wetland.

The Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation Habitat Trust will complete land-purchase proceedings in co-operation with the Province of Saskatchewan and Wildlife Habitat Canada on the 1433-ha Horseshoe Lake Heritage Marsh during 1985. This Heritage Marsh, located 32 km north of Yorkton, was also in serious jeopardy of being drained because of uncontrolled flooding of agricultural land. Flood control and an improved wetland vegetation regime will be established through the use of restriction dams, water control structures, and outlet improvements. Initiation of construction of these works is scheduled for late 1985.

Construction will continue on the Upper Whitesand Heritage Marsh complex, which is comprised of 14 individual basins totalling 3163 ha.

Manitoba

The Manitoba program for 1985 calls for the construction of 47 project segments and 11 project improvements. An area of 3631 ha of waterfowl habitat will be developed with the new projects.

Among the larger undertakings will be Jimmie Lake, 90 km northwest of Winnipeg in the Interlake region. The 380-ha elongated marsh will be divided into two

cells by two dikes with water-level control structures in each dike. A 5-km outlet ditch will be dug to ensure adequate drawdown capability. Five sinuous ditches will be excavated in the marsh, and the earth used as spoil islands for nesting. Eight standard nesting islands are also planned.

Mickle Lake project, on the edge of the Birdtail Creek Valley in western Manitoba, will preserve a complex of typical pothole country wetlands as an all-summer, brood-rearing area for Mallards and other dabbling species. Four landowners who farm around the marsh area are very receptive to DU Canada installing dikes and water controls that will permit water management on five basins and secure a sixth from drainage. Small nesting islands will be constructed in five of the six basins.

Manitoba is hopeful that final approval on three large marsh developments (Vestfold and Portia complexes and Lizard Lake) will be obtained early in 1985. If so, a start may be made on those projects as well.

Ontario

DU Canada will move aggressively into the claybelt area of northern Ontario with five projects planned for this region.

In total, 40 new project segments will be started in the province and two carryovers completed encompassing 1269 ha of waterfowl habitat. Another eight segments are slated for improvements. Nine carryover projects will be worked on early in the year.

The 400-ha Whitefish River project, 50 km east of Timmins, is one of the larger northern projects to be developed in 1985. The riverine marsh will be laced by serpentine ditches to break up heavy cattail mats and create open water for broods and moulting adults. It is expected that the marsh will attract many more Mallard and Black Duck pairs after the habitat is improved.

Hillman Marsh, a 189-ha wetland bordering Lake Erie and located only 5 km north of Point Pelee National Park has been given the go-ahead following signing of easement agreements with all involved landowners.

An extensive pump-and-dike system will be installed to permit a full range of water-level control. Hillman Marsh is an exceptional staging area for waterfowl, and will be a promising nesting and brood-rearing area once vegetation management is introduced.

Two carryover projects, the 91-ha Foxboro Marsh near Belleville, and the 35-ha Wall project near Smith Falls, will be completed this spring. Nesting habitat at both is described as "excellent".

Quebec

In 1985, 22 new marsh segments will be developed in Quebec, and one carryover will be completed. Seven project segments will be improved. A total of 1279 ha of waterfowl habitat will be developed.

Kistibich is the Indian name of one of the new projects for 1985. The 380-ha site near the northern city of Rouyn will be a restored marsh once a new dam is built. The DU Canada dam will replace one installed several decades ago by a mining company to create a reservoir for the company water supply.

Phase II of a DU Canada project on the Beauharnois Canal southwest of Montreal on the St. Lawrence River will get underway in 1985. The project is being undertaken with the assistance of Hydro Quebec. Old dikes surrounding settling ponds along the north shore of the canal will be repaired to impound 202 ha of marshland. Once this is done, management practices will be introduced to control the growth of phragmites that choke up the marsh on both sides of the canal.

Upstream from Beauharnois is the bulge in the upper St. Lawrence River known as Lac St. Francis. In a National Wildlife Area administered by CWS, DU Canada will enclose a 50-ha dried cattail marsh with a ring dike and restore the wetland to wildlife production. Water from spring snowmelt should be adequate to fill the marsh up to operating level in most spring seasons. If not, a pumping system installed this year will provide backup.

Atlantic

New habitat developed in the Maritime Provinces in 1985 should total 1012 ha following completion of 32 new project segments plus two projects carried over from 1984. Seven project segments will be improved.

Most of the marshes worked on will be small in size, but they have potential to be highly productive.

A typical example is Glenfinnan No. 2 in Prince Edward Island, a 10-ha pond owned by a private angling club. Once DU Canada constructs a new concrete and sheet-steel weir complete with fish passage, the pond will be drawn down and deepened to increase its capacity for both waterfowl and speckled trout. By the spring of 1986, the total marsh environment will have been greatly enhanced, so that normal water control operations can proceed according to a multi-year cycle.

About 34 ha of waterfowl brood area will be created with the installation of a dike and water-control structure at the outlet of the Moose Ridge Marsh near McGowans Corner in New Brunswick.

While the marsh is overflowing in the spring and fall, it is virtually dry in the summer months. The control will maintain about 1 m of water in the lowlands.

Henderson Brook near West Wentworth, NS is a meandering stream cutting through the middle of a 19-ha wetland. DU Canada has now obtained support from surrounding landowners to construct an earthen embankment across the stream, complete with a water-control structure with fishway facilities. The dam will retain about 70 cm of water over the marsh and create a brood area that will be sustained for the full summer season.

1985 budget

Income

Requested from Ducks Unlimited Inc.	$35 280 000
Contributors' revenue	3 725 000
Miscellaneous	200 000
Add 1984 under-expenditure	110 000
Total income, 1985	$39 315 000

Expenditure

Development of waterfowl habitat	$31 272 000
Operation and maintenance of habitat areas	3 877 000
Waterfowl population surveys	293 000
Public Relations and Contributor Services	2 934 000
Planning and control	939 000
Total expenditure, 1985	$39 315 000

Report (program highlights)

CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ENDANGERED SPECIES OF WILD FAUNA AND FLORA (CITES)

As the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species approaches the 10th anniversary of its entry into force on 1 July 1975, more than half the approximately 160 nations in the world are now party to it. With the exception of Mexico, all major countries involved in the trade of animals and plants as well as their parts, derivatives, and manufactured products belong to CITES. Between 1 April 1984 and 31 March 1985, three countries added their names to the list of CITES Parties: Benin, the Netherlands, and Trinidad and Tobago. This brought the total number of CITES Parties to 87.

In an effort to keep the diversified groups of people having an interest in CITES up-to-date with the regulations and the basic requirements of the Convention, CITES officers met with many people during 1984. Training of enforcement officers continued, with nearly 250 Customs officers attending a total of 28 seminars on CITES. Most of the seminars were held at the Customs Training College in Rigaud, Quebec, with "field" sessions at Montreal, Quebec City, Niagara Falls, Fort Erie, and Hamilton. In addition, approximately 90 RCMP officers participated in seminars in Ottawa and Regina, or attended along with Customs at the sessions in Niagara Falls and Hamilton. As of 1 December 1984, approximately 1615 Customs and RCMP officers had attended over 140 CITES seminars since the inception of the program.

Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources (OMNR) personnel continue to show an increasing interest in CITES. At the request of the OMNR, presentations were given in North Bay, Englehart, and Thunder Bay to 72 people, mainly conservation officers. The Association des biologistes du Québec (ABQ) also expressed an interest in CITES, resulting in a speech at a regular meeting of the ABQ in Quebec City on 17 November 1984. Approximately 75 people heard the CITES speech. In addition, the yearly update on CITES was provided to the Canadian Association of Zoological Parks and Aquariums (CAZPA) at their annual meeting held in Winnipeg, 6-8 September 1984.

A continuing and nagging problem for Customs and the RCMP in enforcing the CITES regulations is identification, not only of living specimens but also of their parts and products. At least partially to overcome this problem, CWS has obtained under contract the services of identification consultants in major centres across Canada. By way of 15 contracts, some with major organizations such as museums, zoos, and universities, and with several other people working free of charge, assistance with identification is now provided in Halifax, Montreal, Toronto, London, Winnipeg, Saskatoon, Edmonton, Calgary, and Vancouver. In addition, the CITES staff have been supplementing the efforts of the identification consultants by identifying goods detained by Customs in Montreal, Toronto, and Ottawa. A total of 26 days during the year were spent by CITES staff providing this service.

International scene

The CITES Management and Scientific Authorities of CWS represented Canada on several occasions on the international scene. In June 1984, the Management

Authority attended a seminar for African states on the implementation of CITES, as well as a meeting of the CITES Technical Committee. Following these two meetings, both of which were held in Brussels, Belgium, the Management Authority travelled to Switzerland to represent the North American region at a meeting of the CITES Standing Committee.

During November 1984, 123 proposals to amend the CITES Appendices were received from the CITES Secretariat in Switzerland. The proposals are for consideration at the 5th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CITES scheduled for 22 April-3 May 1985 in Buenos Aires, Argentina. Of interest to Canada were proposals for the transfer of the narwhal, Monodon monoceros, from Appendix II to Appendix I; the addition of the hooded seal, Cystophora cristata, to Appendix II; the transfer of the North American populations of the Gyrfalcon, Falco rusticolus, from Appendix II to Appendix I, and the addition to Appendix II of all cranes, Gruidae spp., not already regulated. In preparing Canadian positions on these proposals and other related CITES matters, both the Management and Scientific Authorities travelled to Washington, DC, on two occasions to obtain background information. In addition, input from the public was sought at a public hearing held on 12 March 1985 in Hull, Quebec.

In 1984, federal, provincial, and territorial CITES authorities issued 3597 endangered species export permits mainly for Appendix II species. During the same period the federal authority approved 38 endangered species import permits for Appendix I specimens, 29 transit certificates primarily for temporary entry of circus animals, and 51 scientific certificates for the non-commercial loan, donation, or exchange between scientists of prepared scientific specimens.

Report (program highlights)

CANADIAN WILDLIFE FEDERATION

K.A. Brynaert
Executive Vice-president
Canadian Wildlife Federation

The Canadian Wildlife Federation (CWF) annual promotional campaign for new members resulted in a 5% increase in membership, compared to our previous year. As of June 1985, we have 560 000 members and supporters across Canada. We continue to rank as the second largest conservation organization in the world, second only to the National Wildlife Federation in the USA. On a per capita basis, we have remained the largest.

Our gross revenue for 1984 was $5.98 million. The 1984-85 budget has been set for a gross of $6.89 million.

During the past year, the CWF undertook to expand its program base. Two particular initiatives deserve special mention: the fulfilment of our commitment to provide bilingual publications and services, and the establishment of a major fisheries program.

In January we launched "Biosphere", the French equivalent of our official publication, "International wildlife". This event was preceded by a major transition within the CWF to provide full bilingual services to members and the public. During the next 5 years we will be phasing in a bilingual component that will affect all programs and operations. CWF has, of course, provided French language publications and services in the past. The measures taken in recent months will serve to offer all services, etc. in both official languages. This move represents our concern that the message of conservation be fully conveyed to all people of Canada.

Our initiatives respecting fisheries arose as a result of the impending crisis facing freshwater fisheries. We have undertaken an intensive, broad, and in-depth review of the status of Canada's freshwater fisheries for the purpose of establishing the goals and strategies required for effective management of the resources upon which recreational fisheries depend. This independent review will cover all aspects of freshwater fisheries--commercial, recreational, and native--including management, allocation, licensing, regulations, use, remedial and developmental measures, as well as social and economic benefits and costs. The review, which is currently in progress, will be completed by the end of 1986. David Griggs, Director General of Evaluation and Audit in the federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans, has been seconded to the CWF for a 2-year period to assist in this endeavour.

Environment Canada

This past year has witnessed a traumatic upheaval within the Department of Environment constituting a major setback for wildlife conservation in Canada. CWF mounted extensive and on-going opposition to the (former) Minister's decision that subjected the Canadian Wildlife Service to being a target for budgetary cuts

within the department. The cutbacks have destroyed the Service's ability to properly and fully fulfil its role as a federal agency responsible for wildlife. The move, taken without consultation with the provinces or wildlife organizations, is indicative of blatant disregard for the value of wildlife resources. Opposition to these initiatives was included in the CWF's submission to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry delivered in February 1985.

The CWF continues to be deeply disturbed by the actions and statements made by the (former) Minister of Environment. We have taken exception to the recent remarks that have not ruled out the possibility of permitting commercial mining and forestry operations in Canada's national parks. Such action would violate both the law and government policy.

Further, with respect to national parks, CWF participated in the public consultation process related to the "Four mountain parks". The essence of our position was that the primary responsibility of Parks Canada must rest in the protection of park resources and maintenance in a manner that leaves parks unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations. As a matter of record, we have consistently objected to any substantial development within parks. We also reiterated our concern about the impact of the reduction in Canadian Wildlife Service staff on Parks Canada's ability to conduct research and to assess and monitor environmental impacts associated with the implementation of the parks management plans.

Other issues

Throughout the year, CWF has continued its involvement in a variety of issues, several of which I propose to highlight briefly. In addition to our on-going efforts related to acid rain, CWF undertook to stimulate and launch further action in the United States, in co-operation with the National Wildlife Federation, to declare joint dissatisfaction with the course of action to further study the issue, as proposed during the meeting between Prime Minister Brian Mulroney and President Ronald Reagan. Action was commenced by both federations in March to urge the heads of state to favour a plan that will result in steps to effect the actual reduction of sulphur emissions in both countries.

Two submissions also deserve further comment. In November 1984, CWF submitted a brief to the Royal Commission on Seals and the Sealing Industry in Canada that reflected our view that current management practices are adequate in ensuring the conservation and protection of northwest Atlantic and Arctic seal species, and neither population appears to be threatened or endangered. In December 1984, we brought forward a submission to the Inquiry on Federal Water Policy to represent a variety of wildlife concerns, and emphasize that deterioration in water quality and quantity, and in habitats such as wetlands, seriously damages wildlife populations.

On the international level, the CWF participated in several meetings related to our concerns, including CITES in Buenos Aires, Argentina. At the CITES meeting we were greatly disturbed that, firstly, three proposals by foreign nations were made to restrict international trade in Canadian species in spite of scientific evidence that none of the proposed species was endangered, and secondly, one of these proposals (the Gyrfalcon) was approved for Appendix I. The apparent disregard for scientific evidence undermines the credibility of the Convention.

On a lighter note, the federation took pride in hosting a visit to Canada by Prince Albert of Monaco in September 1984 to support the efforts of his late mother, Princess Grace (who became a CWF patron shortly before her death), in providing financial assistance for the Wood Bison Project in Manitoba. Through the Princess Grace Trust Fund, which was initiated by the federation, and under the auspices of the Canadian Wildlife Federation, $70 000 was allocated towards offsetting costs associated with this project.

Finally, I would be remiss not to mention the forthcoming CWF co-sponsored World Conservation Strategy Conference scheduled for 31 May through to 5 June 1986 in Ottawa. Dr. David Munro, consultant for the Canadian Wildlife Federation, will be making a presentation to this meeting on the conference's progress to date. The CWF urges all jurisdictions to ensure that they are represented in this important event. In Canada action has been initiated at the federal level through Environment Canada. Some action has already commenced in the provinces in preparation for the conference. The provincial role in implementing a conservation strategy is vital. Your support is needed.

Project WILD

Last year the CWF submitted proposals inviting wildlife resource agencies to join and implement the Project WILD program within their respective jurisdictions. We are pleased to announce that three provinces have commenced implementation: Alberta (which conducted a pilot program the previous year), Saskatchewan, and Ontario. The provinces of Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island are in the planning phase. World Wildlife Fund Canada has also become a sponsor of the program.

All remaining jurisdictions have expressed positive interest in Project WILD. We anticipate that additional sponsors will be added in the months ahead.

At the time of writing this report approximately 5000 guides have been distributed to the present sponsors. Our initial feedback from workshops, largely from Alberta at this time, has indicated that the teachers' and outdoor educators' response to the program has been very positive and supportive.

In August 1985, the CWF will be hosting a National Leadership Workshop in Ottawa for key wildlife and educational personnel. This workshop is designed to familiarize and train all representatives with respect to how to introduce Project WILD in an educational setting, how to develop and conduct provincial and territorial leadership workshops, and how to implement the program in respective jurisdictions. At the time of writing, all agencies currently participating in the program have indicated that their representatives will be in attendance; most of those remaining are expected to send at least one delegate.

In the United States, Project WILD has been the target of criticism by various animal welfare and rights groups, including the International Fund For Animal Welfare. In essence they have expressed the view that the selection of topics within the guide "reflect a strong bias toward the utilitarian and manipulation-based approach to wildlife". They have taken exception to the use of words such as "resource", "harvest", and "manage", as well as the lack of direct mention of animal welfare groups among resource agencies or organizations. The US Project WILD Steering Committee has recently reviewed specific concerns submitted by these groups and directed to their attention, and will be reporting their position soon. The CWF has been, and will continue, to monitor this situation in the USA.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE 49TH FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL WILDLIFE CONFERENCE

Recommendation No. 1 (Appreciation for hospitality)

That the conference express its appreciation to the Government of Nova Scotia and in particular to the Hon. Kenneth Streatch, Donald Eldridge, Merrill Prime, and other staff of the Department of Lands and Forests for the excellent arrangements and fine hospitality extended to the delegates of the 49th Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference.

Recommendation No. 2 (Thanks for reception)

That the conference express its appreciation to Environment Canada and the Canadian Wildlife Service for the reception on the eve of the 49th Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference.

Recommendation No. 3 (Thanks for breakfast)

That the conference express its appreciation to Ducks Unlimited Canada for hosting a breakfast on 27 June for delegates to the 49th Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference.

Recommendation No. 4 (Appreciation to non-governmental organizations)

That the conference express its appreciation to participants from non-governmental organizations for their contributions to the success of the 49th Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference.

Recommendation No. 5 (Disappointment on absence of British Columbia)

That the conference express its disappointment to the Government of British Columbia on the absence of representation from the Ministry of Environment from that province.

Recommendation No. 6 (Appreciation to J.D. Roseborough, A Murray, and H. Haswell)

Whereas Doug Roseborough, Al Murray, and Hugh Haswell have contributed actively to wildlife management and to the work of the Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference during their distinguished careers,

therefore the 49th Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference directs the Secretary to express to Messrs. Haswell, Murray, and Roseborough its appreciation for their service and best wishes in their retirement.

Recommendation No. 7 (Theme for 1986 National Wildlife Week)

Whereas an effective National Wildlife Week requires a link with identifiable wildlife species, and

whereas a carefully developed theme and message can focus attention on the status and importance of wildlife in Canada, especially to school children,

therefore it is recommended that the 1986 National Wildlife Week theme involve the issue of endangered species of wildlife.

Recommendation No. 8 (Theme for 1987 National Wildlife Week)

Whereas 1987 represents the 100th anniversary of Last Mountain Lake Sanctuary in Saskatchewan, and

whereas this event will focus attention on past and present conservation initiatives with a view to the future, and

whereas success of future conservation efforts hinges on enthusiastic support and co-operation involving government and the public,

therefore it is recommended that consideration be given to a theme for 1987 National Wildlife Week embodying historical and future wildlife conservation in Canada.

Recommendation No. 9 (Maintenance of wildlife programs)

Whereas the wildlife-related activities of the Government of Canada flow from acts of Parliament, the Migratory Birds Convention Act (1917) and the Canada Wildlife Act (1973), and

whereas these activities enable the discharge of both domestic and international responsibilities, and

whereas there has recently been substantial evidence of public support for such activities,

therefore it is recommended that the Government of Canada, in consultation with the governments of the provinces and territories and interested non-governmental organizations, maintain a vigorous program for the benefit of wildlife and its users throughout Canada.

Recommendation No. 10 (Preparation for 1987 CITES conference)

Whereas Canada will host the next meeting of the Parties of CITES in 1987, and

whereas the time to begin preparations for that meeting is now,

therefore it is recommended that federal, provincial, and territorial governments and national non-governmental organizations establish a close working relationship in order to ensure: that Canadian positions and concerns be negotiated well before the next meeting; that the roles and responsibilities of delegation members be defined; that Canada's CITES administration and scientific programs be well supported over the 2 years between meetings of the Parties; and that responses to Canadian CITES issues arising from the 1985 meeting be finalized as soon as possible.

Recommendation No. 11 (Adoption of procedures - CITES)

Whereas considerable dissatisfaction has been expressed regarding the procedures used at the Buenos Aires meeting of the Parties to CITES, and

whereas these procedures appear to have hampered the effectiveness of our Canadian delegation,

therefore it is recommended that this conference urge the CITES Secretariat to pursue the adoption of procedures that give due credit to technical information when additions or changes to listed species are considered.

Recommendation No. 12 (Dissolution of CCUM)

Whereas a number of species and/or region-specific committees focusing on ungulate management have been established in Canada, and

whereas these specialist committees now largely fulfil the purpose of the Canadian Committee on Ungulate Management,

therefore it is recommended that the Canadian Committee on Ungulate Management be dissolved, and that past and present participants in that committee be thanked for their contributions.

Recommendation No. 13 (Future timing of conference)

Whereas it is recognized that the Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference is traditionally held in the last week of June each year, and

whereas these dates usually conflict with St-Jean-Baptiste Day, which is a statutory holiday not only for the Parliament of Canada but for citizens residing in the Province of Quebec,

therefore it is recommended that future conferences be scheduled to avoid conflict with St-Jean-Baptiste Day.

Recommendation No. 14 ("World conservation strategy")

Whereas the conference notes the significance of the "World conservation strategy" for wildlife management within the context of land-use and development planning, and

whereas it believes that the process of formulating conservation strategies would provide a vehicle for beneficial consultation among resource management agencies and interests, and for establishing more constructive, long-term, cross-sectorial working relationships, and

whereas it is noted also that an international conference on conservation and development, implementing the "World conservation strategy", will be held in Ottawa from 31 May to 5 June 1986, and that it is desirable that Canadian jurisdictions are able to show significant progress in this connection,

therefore it is recommended that wildlife administrations associate themselves with the formulation of conservation strategies in those jurisdictions where they are under way, and that they stimulate and support the initiation of conservation strategies in other jurisdictions.

Recommendation No. 15 (Communicating about wildlife)

Whereas an in-depth discussion on communicating about wildlife and wildlife management has taken place at the 49th Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference, and

whereas assessments of past events and the knowledge of communication experts have revealed that appropriate communication is crucial to the survival of wildlife management, and

whereas the repercussions of controversial wildlife issues often transcend boundaries of jurisdictions,

therefore it is recommended that all governments be encouraged to improve communication efforts and that governments be encouraged to develop, implement, and if appropriate exchange communication plans as components of wildlife management programs.

Recommendation No. 16 (Establishment of trust fund - CITES)

Whereas the Conference of the Parties to CITES will be held in Canada in 1987, and

whereas it is important that sufficient funding be available to ensure that activities designed to promote and support Canadian positions among international delegates may be carried out,

therefore it is recommended that each agency responsible for wildlife management in Canada, as well as interested non-governmental organizations, consider contributions during the next two fiscal years to a trust fund to be established by the Canadian Wildlife Service to support such activities.

ATTENDANCE AT 49TH CONFERENCE

Steve Anderson
Wildlife Division
Department of Lands and Forests
PO Box 516
Kentville, Nova Scotia
B4N 3X3

R. (Bob) Andrews
Director of Wildlife
Fish and Wildlife Division
Department of Energy and
Natural Resources
Petroleum Plaza, North Tower
9945 - 108 Street
Edmonton, Alberta
T5K 2C9

Peter Austin-Smith
Manager, Wildlife Resources
Department of Lands and
Forests
PO Box 516
Kentville, Nova Scotia
B4N 3X3

David Ayles
Past President
Nova Scotia Wildlife Federation
18 Carnation Crescent
Halifax, Nova Scotia
B3R 2E9

H. Bagdadi
Interprète
Section des conférences
en langues officielles
Division de l'interprétation
Bureau des traductions
Secrétariat d'Etat
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0M5

John Baird
Chief Wildlife Biologist
Fish and Wildlife Branch
Department of Natural Resources
PO Box 6000
Fredericton, New Brunswick
E3B 5H1

Robert Bancroft, Biologist
Department of Lands and Forests
Provincial Building
11 James Street
Antigonish, Nova Scotia
B2G 1R6

Dan Banks, Biologist
Department of Lands and Forests
PO Box 610
Baddeck, Victoria County
Nova Scotia
B0E 1B0

David Banks, Clerk
Department of Lands and Forests
PO Box 516
Kentville, Nova Scotia
B4N 3X3

Bob Bell, Chief
Wildlife Management Division
Department of Renewable Resources
Government of the Northwest Territories
Yellowknife, Northwest Territories
X1A 2L9

John Benjamin
Executive Assistant to the Minister
Department of Lands and Forests
PO Box 698
Halifax, Nova Scotia
B3J 2T9

Jack Berryman
Executive Vice-President
International Association of
Fish and Wildlife Agencies
1412 - 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
USA

Mrs. Sheila Billard, Secretary
Department of Lands and Forests
PO Box 698
Halifax, Nova Scotia
B3J 2T9

Kenneth A. Brynaert
Executive Vice-President
Canadian Wildlife Federation
1673 Carling Avenue
Ottawa, Ontario
K2A 3Z1

Arthur H. Buck
Chairman
Government Affairs Committee
CAZPA
100 Westmorland Street
Moncton, New Brunswick
E1C 5B2

Frank Cardinal
Regional Director
Peace River Office
Bag 900-26
Provincial Building
Peace River, Alberta
T0H 2X0

R.L. Carter
Deputy Minister
Department of Natural Resources
Province of Manitoba
Room 215, Legislative Building
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3C 0V8

J. Cinq-Mars
Directeur régional
Région du Québec
Service canadien de la faune
Environnement Canada
1141, route de l'Eglise
CP 10100
Sainte-Foy (Québec)
G1V 4H5

Lorne Colpitts
Chief, Habitat Management
Department of Natural Resources
Province of Manitoba
PO Box 24
1495 St. James Street
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3H 0W9

Dr. Herb Cowburn
Chairman of the Board
Ducks Unlimited Canada
800 Spadina Crescent, East
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
S7K 3H4

Kenneth W. Cox
National Program Co-ordinator
Wildlife Habitat Canada
1704 Carling Avenue
Ottawa, Ontario
K2A 1C7

Robert B. Crockett
Crockett McConnell Inc.
Route 3A, Oakhill
PO Box 500
Bridgewater, Nova Scotia
B4V 2X6

Tom Crowther, Publisher
The Daily Gleaner and
the Atlantic Advocate
PO Box 3370
Fredericton, New Brunswick
E3B 5A2

Steve Curtis
Regional Director
Ontario Region
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
1725 Woodward Drive
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0E7

Y. Dambergs
Interprète
Section des conférences
en langues officielles
Division de l'interprétation
Bureau des traductions
Secrétariat d'Etat
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0M5

Barry Diamond
Director
Parks and Recreation
Department of Lands and Forests
RR 1, Belmont
Colchester County, Nova Scotia
B0M 1C0

Dr. Don Dodds, Professor
Wildlife Management
Acadia University
Wolfville, Nova Scotia
B0P 1X0

Yvon Dubé
Directeur général adjoint
de la faune
Ministère du Loisir,
de la Chasse et de la Pêche
Gouvernement du Québec
150, boulevard Saint-Cyrille est
Québec (Québec)
G1R 4Y3

Tony Duke
Wildlife Biologist
Department of Lands and Forests
PO Box 68
Truro, Nova Scotia
B2N 5B8

Don Eldridge
Deputy Minister
Department of Lands and Forests
PO Box 698
Halifax, Nova Scotia
B3J 2T9

Alison Evans
Biologist
NESIK Biological Research Station
PO Box 428
Waverley, Nova Scotia
B0N 2S0

Dan Feehan
Technician
International Simultaneous
Translation Service
90 Montée de Liesse
Montreal, Quebec
H4T 1N4

Dr. George Finney
A/Director
Wildlife Research and
Interpretation Branch
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0E7

Arthur F. Frayling
Chairman
International Fur Trade Federation
67 Upper Thames Street
London EC4V 3AH
England

Ray Gilbert
Executive Director
Fur Institute of Canada
Suite 205, PO Box 29
60 Bloor Street, West
Toronto, Ontario
M4W 3B8

Allan Glover
Maritime Manager
Ducks Unlimited Canada
32 Church Street
Amherst, Nova Scotia
B4H 3Y6

Paul Gray, Supervisor
Habitat Management
Wildlife Management Division
Department of Renewable Resources
Government of the
Northwest Territories
Yellowknife, Northwest Territories
X1A 2L9

Doug Hagan, Supervisor
Program Development
Wildlife Branch
Ministry of Natural Resources
Room 2321, Whitney Block
Queen's Park
Toronto, Ontario
M7A 1W3

Ross Hall, Biologist
Department of Lands and Forests
626 College Road
Bible Hill, Colchester County
Nova Scotia
B2N 2R2

William (Bill) Hall
Section Head
Game Management
Fish and Wildlife Division
Department of Energy and
Natural Resources
5th Floor, Bramalea Building
9920 - 108 Street
Edmonton, Alberta
T5K 2C9

Mrs. Jeanne Halleran
Logistics Co-ordinator
BC Wildlife Federation
Box 10
Kaslo, British Columbia
V0G 1M0

Michael Halleran
Director of Communications
BC Wildlife Federation
Box 10
Kaslo, British Columbia
V0G 1M0

Dave Harris, Biologist
Department of Lands and Forests
Coxheath Depot
RR 6, Sydney
Cape Breton County
Nova Scotia
B1P 6T2

Hans Heinrich Hatlapa
President CIC
Kommission Environment
2351 Grossenaspe
OB Neumunster (Holst)
West Germany

Joseph Y. Hickman
Past President
Canadian Wildlife Federation
2898 Doug Smith Drive
Halifax, Nova Scotia
B3L 3T7

Harry E. Hodgdon
Executive Director
The Wildlife Society
5410 Grosvenor Lane
Bethesda, Maryland 20814
USA

Barry Hughson
Faunal Scientist
Parks Canada
Environment Canada
2nd Floor, North Tower
Les Terrasses de la Chaudière
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 1G2

Monte Hummel
President
World Wildlife Fund Canada
Suite 201
60 St. Clair Avenue, East
Toronto, Ontario
M4T 1N5

Jim Inder
Assistant Deputy Minister
Parks, Recreation, and Wildlife
Department of Culture,
Recreation and Youth
Province of Newfoundland
PO Box 4750
St. John's, Newfoundland
A1C 5T7

J.A. (Tony) Keith
A/Regional Director
Western and Northern Region
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
1000, 9942 - 108 Street
Edmonton, Alberta
T5K 2J5

Gordon R. Kerr
Assistant to the Director General
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
Ottawa, Ontario.
K1A 0E7

Alanna Koch
Ministerial Assistant
Department of Parks and
Renewable Resources
Room 340
Legislative Building
Regina, Saskatchewan
S4S 0B3

Dr. Gregory T. Koeln, Director
Habitat Inventory and Evaluation
Ducks Unlimited, Inc.
One Waterfowl Way at Gilmer Road
Long Grove, Illinois 60047-0216
USA

Elmer Kure, Director
Environmental Public Relations
Alberta Fish and Game Association
Box 2100, R #1
Innisfail, Alberta
T0M 1A0

Lance Laviolette
Wildlife Division
Department of Lands and Forests
PO Box 516
Kentville, Nova Scotia
B4N 3X3

Kevin Lloyd, Supervisor
Wildlife Population Management
Department of Renewable Resources
Yellowknife, Northwest Territories
X1A 2L9

Mme F. Longhurst
Interprète
Section des conférences
en langues officielles
Division de l'interprétation
Bureau des traductions
Secrétariat d'Etat
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0M5

Dr. A.J. (Sandy) Macaulay
Chief Biologist
Ducks Unlimited Canada
1190 Waverly Street
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3T 2E2

Hugh MacIsaac
Department of Lands and Forests
PO Box 698
Halifax, Nova Scotia
B3J 2T9

Linda Maltby
Special Adviser and Planning Co-ordinator
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0E7

S.F. Manuel
Deputy Minister
Department of Culture,
Recreation and Youth
Province of Newfoundland
PO Box 4750
St. John's, Newfoundland
A1C 5T7

Hon. William Mathews, MHA
Minister of Culture, Recreation
and Youth
Province of Newfoundland
PO Box 4750
St. John's, Newfoundland
A1C 5T7

Hon. Colin Maxwell, MLA
Minister of Parks and Renewable Resources
Province of Saskatchewan
Room 340
Legislative Building
Regina, Saskatchewan
S4S 0B3

Douglas McKone
Senior Adviser
Fisheries Ecology
Fisheries and Oceans Canada
200 Kent Street
Ottawa, Ontario.
K1A 0E6

Doug McLeod
Executive Assistant to the
Minister of Lands and Forests
PO Box 698
Halifax, Nova Scotia
B3J 2T9

Hon. George McMahon, MLA
Minister of Community and
Cultural Affairs
Province of Prince Edward Island
11 Kent Street
PO Box 2000
Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island
C1A 7N8

Barry Meadows, Director
Fish and Wildlife Branch
Department of Natural Resources
Province of New Brunswick
PO Box 6000
Fredericton, New Brunswick
E3B 5H1

John Mills
Technician
Department of Lands and Forests
PO Box 516
Kentville, Nova Scotia
B4N 3X3

Don Minnich
Deputy Associate Director
Wildlife Management
US Fish and Wildlife Service
Department of the Interior
18th and C Streets, NW
Room 3252
Washington, DC 20240
USA

Denis Minty
Information and Education
Co-ordinator
Department of Culture,
Recreation and Wildlife
PO Box 4750
St. John's, Newfoundland
A1C 5T7

Hugh Monaghan, Director
Fish and Wildlife Branch
Department of Renewable Resources
Government of the Yukon Territory
Box 2703, 10 Burns Road
Whitehorse, Yukon Territory
Y1A 2C6

Rick Morgan
Executive Vice-President
Ontario Federation of
Anglers and Hunters
PO Box 28
Peterborough, Ontario
K9J 6Y5

Dr. David Munro
Canadian Wildlife Federation
2513 Amherst Avenue
Sydney, British Columbia
V8L 2H3

Allan Murray
553 View Royal Avenue
Victoria, British Columbia
V9B 1B9

David Neave
Executive Director
Wildlife Habitat Canada
Suite 301
1704 Carling Avenue
Ottawa, Ontario
K2A 1C7

Mrs. Sylvia Normand
Assistant Secretary
Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0E7

Mike O'Brien, Biologist
Department of Lands and Forests
Box 23, Site 2, RR 1
Waverley, Halifax County
Nova Scotia B0N 2S0

Dr. James H. Patterson
Director
Migratory Birds Branch
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0E7

Art Patton, Manager
Wildlife Resources
Department of Lands and Forests
PO Box 516
Kentville, Nova Scotia
B4N 3X3

Fred Payne, Manager
Wildlife Resources
Department of Lands and Forests
PO Box 516
Kentville, Nova Scotia
B4N 3X3

Ellen O'Connor
Department of Lands and Forests
PO Box 698
Halifax, Nova Scotia
B3J 2T9

Doreen Pearson
Department of Lands and Forests
PO Box 698
Halifax, Nova Scotia
B3J 2T9

Brian O. Pelchat
Senior Big-game Biologist
Yukon Department of
Renewable Resources
PO Box 2703
Whitehorse, Yukon Territory
Y1A 2C6

E.W. (Casey) Pendergast
Manager
Enforcement and Hunter Safety
Department of Lands and Forests
PO Box 698
Halifax, Nova Scotia
B3J 2T9

D.G. Pike, Director
Wildlife Division
Department of Culture, Recreation,
and Youth
PO Box 4750
St. John's, Newfoundland
A1C 5T7

Douglas K. Pollock, Director
Management & Administration Branch
Canadian Wildlife Service
(Secretary, Federal-Provincial
Wildlife Conference)
Environment Canada
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0E7

Daniel A. Poole
President
Wildlife Management Institute
Suite 725
1101 - 14th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
USA

James R. Potter
Director
Federation of Alberta Naturalists
Box 413
Blackfalds, Alberta
T0M 0J0

W.H. (Bill) Prescott
A/Regional Director
Atlantic Region
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
PO Box 1590
Sackville, New Brunswick
E0A 3C0

Merrill H. Prime
Director, Wildlife Division
Department of Lands and Forests
PO Box 516
Kentville, Nova Scotia
B4N 3X3

David Quinton
Producer
Land and Sea
PO Box 12010
St. John's, Newfoundland
A1B 3T8

Carl Radimer
Manager Editor
Informart, Suite 511
1661 Portage Avenue
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3J 3T7

Wayne Roddick
Communications Adviser
Wildlife Habitat Canada
Suite 301
1704 Carling Avenue
Ottawa, Ontario.
K2A 1C7

Barry Sabean, Manager
Wildlife Resources
Department of Lands and Forests
PO Box 516
Kentville, Nova Scotia
B4N 3X3

Gary Saunders
Forest Resources
Department of Lands and Forests
PO Box 68
Truro, Nova Scotia
B2N 5B8

Ron Seney
Sentinel Safety Consultants
PO Box 1523
Wolfeville, Nova Scotia
B0P 1X0

Gregg Sheehy
Conservation Director
Canadian Nature Federation
75 Albert Street
Suite 203
Ottawa, Ontario
K1P 6G1

James Shepard
Director
National/International Operations
Ducks Unlimited, Inc.
1 Waterfowl Way at Gilmer Road
Long Grove, Illinois 60047-0216
USA

Dennis Sherratt
Director, Wildlife Branch
Department of Parks and
Renewable Resources
Province of Saskatchewan
3211 Albert Street
Regina, Saskatchewan
S4S 5W6

Roger Simmons, MHA
Member for Fortune-Hermitage
House of Assembly
Confederation Building
St. John's, Newfoundland
A1C 5T7

Arthur Smith, Director
Fish and Wildlife Unit
Department of Community and
Cultural Affairs
Province of Prince Edward Island
Jones Building, 11 Kent Street
PO Box 2000
Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island
C1A 7N8

Dale Smith
Manager, Parks Planning
Parks Division
Department of Lands and Forests
RR #1
Belmont
Colchester County, Nova Scotia
B0M 1C0

John Smith
Senior Director
Program Planning
Department of Lands and Forests
PO Box 698
Halifax, Nova Scotia
B3J 2T9

Kirk Smith
Co-ordinator, Public Information
Fur Institute of Canada
Suite 205, PO Box 29
60 Bloor Street West
Toronto, Ontario
M4W 3B8

R. Keith Smith
Principal
Agricultural Extension Centre
1129 Queens Avenue
Brandon, Manitoba
R7A 1L9

Dr. Ian Stirling
Research Scientist
Western and Northern Region
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
1000, 9942 - 108 Street
Edmonton, Alberta
T5K 2J5

Jim Stoner
A/Regional Director
Pacific and Yukon Region
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
PO Box 340
Delta, British Columbia
V4K 2Y3

Hon. Kenneth Streatch, Minister
Department of Lands and Forests
PO Box 698
Halifax, Nova Scotia
B3J 2T9

Bert Tétreault
Director General
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0E7

James Tessier
Executive Assistant to Minister
of Culture, Recreation, and Youth
Province of Newfoundland
PO Box 4750
St. John's, Newfoundland
A1C 5T7

Ross C. Thompson
Chief, Wildlife Management
Wildlife Branch
Department of Natural Resources
Box 24, 1495 St. James Street
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3H 0W9

Assegid Tirunem
Game Warden - Ethiopia
c/o Acadia University
Wolfville, Nova Scotia
B0P 1X0

Art Tobin, President
Nova Scotia Wildlife Federation
Victoria Road
North Sydney
Cape Breton County
Nova Scotia

Paul Tufts, Biologist
Department of Lands and Forests
10 Starr's Road
Yarmouth, Nova Scotia
B5A 2T1

Neil van Nostrand
Manager, Wildlife Resources
Department of Lands and Forests
PO Box 516
Kentville, Nova Scotia
B4N 3X3

John A. Waugh
Eastern Regional Manager
Ducks Unlimited Canada
PO Box 61
Amherst, Nova Scotia
B4H 3Y6

Leonard Werner
President
Hudson's Bay Company
Fur Sales Canada Limited
65 Skyway Avenue
Rexdale, Ontario
M9W 6C7

Laurel Whistance-Smith
Supervisor
Extension Development
Wildlife Branch
Ministry of Natural Resources
Queen's Park
Toronto, Ontario
M7A 1W3

W. (Bill) Young
President
Canadian Forestry Association
of British Columbia
410 - 1200 West Pender Street
Vancouver, British Columbia
V6E 2S9

Report

ACTION TAKEN ON RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE 48TH FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL WILDLIFE CONFERENCE

D.K. Pollock
Secretary, Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference

Recommendation No. 1 (Appreciation for hospitality)

That the conference express its appreciation to the Government of Ontario and to the Hon. Alan Pope, John Sloan, Douglas Roseborough, and their staff for the excellent arrangements and hospitality extended to the delegates of the 48th Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference.

Action

Letters of appreciation sent to the Hon. Alan Pope, John Sloan, and Douglas Roseborough. Action completed.

Recommendation No. 2 (Thanks for reception)

That the conference express its appreciation to Environment Canada and the Canadian Wildlife Service for the reception held on the eve of the conference.

Action

Thank-you memorandum sent to B. Tétreault. Action completed.

Recommendation No. 3 (Thanks for barbecue)

That the conference express its appreciation to the Canadian Wildlife Federation, Ontario Trappers' Association, and the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters for the buffalo and beaver barbecue on Tuesday night.

Action

Thank-you letters sent to the Canadian Wildlife Federation, Ontario Trappers' Association, and the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters. Action completed.

Recommendation No. 4 (Thanks for breakfast)

That the conference express its appreciation to Ducks Unlimited Canada for its hospitality in hosting a breakfast for all delegates on the morning of 20 June.

Action

Thank-you letter sent to Stew Morrison, Ducks Unlimited Canada. Action completed.

Recommendation No. 5 (Appreciation to non-governmental organizations)

That the conference express its appreciation to the non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that have attended the 48th conference and provided valuable participation.

Action

Letters of appreciation sent to all NGO attendees who participated in the conference. Action completed.

Recommendation No. 6 (Appreciation to D.J. Robinson)

Whereas Don Robinson has for over 30 years contributed actively to wildlife research and management and to the work of the Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference,

therefore the 48th Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference directs the Secretary to express to Mr. Robinson its appreciation for his service and best wishes for his retirement.

Action

Letter of appreciation sent to D.J. Robinson. Action completed.

Recommendation No. 7 (Theme of 1985 conference)

Whereas discussions at the 48th Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference have stressed the importance of communication and support between agencies and users, and

effective communication can lead to essential unity and strength on important wildlife issues, and

communication is an integral fact of team-work and would be a natural outgrowth of the 1984 conference theme, and

previous conference themes have not addressed this important topic, and

wildlife managers, administrators, and users stand to gain from upgrading and insight into communication techniques and processes,

therefore it is recommended that the Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference adopt as its 1985 theme, "Communicating about wildlife".

Action

Letters sent to provincial, territorial, and federal jurisdictions as well as national non-governmental organizations asking for comments on ways to develop the agenda and suggestions for speakers. Action completed.

Recommendation No. 8 (Project WILD)

Whereas the Canadian Wildlife Federation has submitted an in-depth proposal to all resource agencies and a summary report to the Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference regarding a "National implementation strategy for Project WILD in Canada",

therefore it is recommended that all provinces and territories, and any interested national NGOs, be encouraged to become full, participating members in the proposed Canadian Project WILD program.

Action

Letters sent to provincial, territorial, and federal jurisdictions and national non-governmental organizations encouraging their participation in the Project WILD program. Action completed.

Recommendation No. 9 (Theme for 1985 National Wildlife Week)

The Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference recommends that the theme for 1985 National Wildlife Week be: "The key to conservation - Responsible stewardship".

Action

Letters sent to provincial, territorial, and federal jurisdictions and national non-governmental organizations informing them that thetheme suggested by the Canadian Wildlife Federation for National Wildlife Week had been unanimously accepted. Action completed.

Recommendation No. 10 (Guidelines for National Wildlife Week program)

It is recommended that the Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference accept the report by the committee reviewing the National Wildlife Week program as amended on 19 June 1984 by the committee in consultation with the Canadian Wildlife Federation.

Action

Letters sent to provincial, territorial, and federal jurisdictions and national non-governmental organizations stating that the conference agreed to accept the amended report of the reviewing committee. Action completed.

Recommendation No. 11 (Canadian Wildlife Management Institute)

Whereas the Task Force was established under Recommendation No. 12 of the 1982 Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference, and

whereas not all of the Task Force responsibilities were completed,

therefore it is recommended that the Task Force mandate be extended to the 1985 Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference, and that a final report be prepared and distributed by 1 January 1985 to all jurisdictions and national NGOs for discussion and decision at the 1985 conference.

Action

Committee members had their first meeting on 4 July 1984. The task proved more difficult and time-consuming than anticipated, and the report that was to have been completed by 1 January 1985 was not done. In a letter to the Conference Secretary (copies to all provincial and federal jurisdictions), dated 18 February 1985, Bob Andrews, Chairman of the Task Force, recommended that this subject not be included in the agenda for discussion this year. He suggested that the establishment of a Canadian Wildlife Management Institute might, in part, be addressed at the Ministers' conference in November.

Recommendation No. 12 (Canadian Wildlife Management Institute)

It is recommended that the interim Canadian Wildlife Management Institute report be made available to NGOs that request it. It is further recommended that the Institute Task Force consider seriously what effect Institute fund-raising might have on existing federal/provincial NGOs; and it is further recommended that the Task Force report scheduled for January 1985 also be circulated to NGOs in attendance at this meeting in Timmins.

Action

The interim report was made available on request; it was also published in the transactions. As the task was not completed, the remainder of the recommendation was not acted on.

Recommendation No. 13 (Appreciation to J.E. Bryant)

Whereas Joe Bryant has worked for many years in the interests of wildlife conservation, and

whereas Joe retired last autumn to pursue his dream of studying environmental law,

therefore the 48th Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference directs the Secretary to express to Mr. Bryant its appreciation for his years of dedicated service, and to wish him well in his ambitious new venture.

Action

Letter of appreciation sent to Joe Bryant. Action completed.

Recommendation No. 14 ("Canadian wildlife administration")

Whereas several reviews and assessments of the usefulness of "Canadian wildlife administration" have been conducted since its inception in 1975, and

whereas these reviews have consistently recommended continuance of the journal, with the focus of content on the administrative aspects of wildlife management, and

whereas the evaluation of the "Canadian wildlife administration" journal carried out in conjunction with this year's Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference re-affirmed the foregoing,

therefore it is recommended that:

(1) the "Canadian wildlife administration" journal, being as much or more needed today as when introduced in 1975, be continued as a medium for the distribution of information about the administrative aspects of wildlife management in Canada, including wildlife law, regulation, policy, organizational arrangements, personnel directories, and the like;

(2) the editorial policy and publishing specifications (based on reviews and assessments to date) be crystallized for review for all jurisdictions and relevant non-governmental organizations and circulated during 1984-85 with the aim of adoption at the 1985 Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference;

(3) Manitoba, as the agency that most recently published this journal, be asked to lead this task with assistance to be provided by the Canadian Wildlife Service and such other jurisdictions as may be required;

(4) the appropriateness of the "Canadian wildlife administration" journal be reviewed if the Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference, as now conceived, is dissolved in favour of a "Canadian Wildlife Conference" as is presently being considered under sponsorship of a new "Canadian Wildlife Management Institute"; and

(5) in keeping with the past rotational order for producing this journal, Alberta be requested to undertake publication of the 1985 edition of "Canadian wildlife administration".

Action

Manitoba has completed a review on the editorial policy and publishing specifications, and at the request of Rich Goulden a copy of their review will be distributed to all jurisdictions on the first day of the conference. Alberta published the 1985 edition of "Canadian wildlife administration". Mr. Goulden is on the agenda to discuss this further.

Recommendation No. 15 (Forestry/Wildlife Symposium)

Whereas, as a result of Recommendation No. 9 of the 46th conference, a Forestry-Wildlife Symposium was held in British Columbia in the spring of 1984, and

whereas the symposium was judged highly successful in exploring the basic issues in interaction and fostering understanding among forest and wildlife managers, and

whereas it would be opportune and in the best interests of both wildlife management and forestry to press forward in the exploration and development of integrated technologies, and

whereas the opportunity to do so is being offered by the Province of Ontario,

therefore it is recommended that:

(1) delegates to the conference support such a symposium in Ontario, if possible in the spring of 1986;

(2) the symposium be focused on current research, new forest and wildlife management technologies, and their effects on integrated management practices;

(3) the papers be solicited from recognized experts with an emphasis on forestry professionals, and that the papers be published;

(4) attendance be open;

(5) Ontario select an organizing committee representing foresters and biologists throughout Canada from federal, provincial, and territorial governments, appropriate non-governmental organizations, the forest industry, and the academic community; and

(6) the organizing committee seek required funding from participants with emphasis on independent financing, similar to arrangements for the BC symposium.

Action

The Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources is scheduled to give an update report during the conference.

Recommendation No. 16 (Team-work guidelines)

Whereas there is a growing need for team-work in identifying opportunities and resolving conflicts in wildlife, and

whereas discussions at the 48th Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference have led to a good description of the needs, opportunities, and formula for team-work on a variety of matters in wildlife management, and

whereas it is important to all participants at the conference to become more proficient in team-work;

therefore it is recommended that the Ontario Wildlife Branch take a lead role in working with workshop rapporteurs in developing a report on the results of those discussions, and work with the Canadian Wildlife Federation in the design and printing of the report.

Action

The report has been published as an "Occasional paper of the 48th Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference" and has been circulated to all jurisdictions.

Recommendation No. 17 (Subsistence use of wildlife)

Whereas it is essential to maintain a rich and diverse culture in Canada, and

whereas the life-style of subsistence users is threatened by lack of action with respect to some of the value judgements being made at the national and international levels,

therefore it is recommended that the Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference recognize that subsistence use is a legitimate and important use of wildlife in Canada, and that the life-style of subsistence users is threatened.

Action

This recommendation was brought to the attention of all jurisdictions, requesting that they take whatever action they deemed necessary.

Recommendation No. 18 (Dependence of Canadians on hunting and trapping)

Whereas the tactics of certain anti-hunting and anti-trapping groups are disrupting the management of Canadian wildlife resources, as well as the livelihoods and self-respect of native and non-native users, and

whereas it is vital that Canadians and their foreign trading partners are aware of the dependence of many Canadians on hunting and trapping;

therefore, it is recommended that this body acknowledge the importance of this matter, and that this be communicated to the Chairman of the September 1984 Wildlife Ministers' Conference.

Action

This recommendation was brought to the attention of the Hon. Alan Pope, Chairman of the Wildlife Ministers' Conference, and a copy was sent to the other wildlife ministers.